

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Validation of the revised Food Neophobia Scale (FNS-R) in the Italian context

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1669520> since 2018-06-11T11:10:20Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.appet.2018.06.004

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Validation of the revised Food Neophobia Scale (FNS-R) in the Italian context

Abstract

Measuring individuals' level of food neophobia, i.e., the reluctance to eat novel food, is a critical task since it negatively affects diet variety and quality. Using structural equations models, the revised Food Neophobia Scale (FNS-R) was validated with a sample of 711 Italian adults. After deleting 4 items characterized by both low face validity and a suboptimal association with the other items, and after correcting statistically for the acquiescent response-set, the resulting 6-item, fully balanced FNS-R showed a good construct validity. Moreover, it showed the expected positive correlations with General Neophobia and with Disgust Sensitivity. Finally, it resulted invariant across participants' genders, age classes, and levels of education, and across methods of administration (paper-and-pencil and on-line). Strong points and possible developments of the study are discussed.

Keywords: Food neophobia scale, general neophobia, disgust sensitivity, confirmatory factor analysis, structural validity, concurrent validity.

Validation of the revised Food Neophobia Scale (FNS-R) in the Italian context

Market globalization, migration flows, and the spread of new lifestyles involving food have considerably increased the availability of novel foods in Western society. This historical and structural evolution puts individuals at the crossroads between, on the one hand, trying these novel foods and enlarging their eating repertoire, and on the other hand, limiting their consumption to familiar foods. Psychologists have termed this latter orientation as food neophobia.

Food neophobia, the reluctance to eat unfamiliar foods, is a universal predisposition among humans and, more generally, omnivores (Rozin & Millman, 1987; Rozin & Vollemecke, 1986). From an evolutionary perspective, each new food represents both an opportunity and a risk: the opportunity to expand the nourishment source set, but also the risk to ingest something dangerous or even life threatening. According to Rozin (1976), food neophobia arises from this ‘omnivore dilemma.’

Notwithstanding the universality of food neophobia, there is room for inter-individual and intra-individual variability. Although serving a protective function in a potentially dangerous environment, in contemporary Western cultures characterized by high levels of food safety, food neophobia can be problematic, because it dramatically constrains individuals’ food choices, limiting consumption variety and worsening diet quality (e.g., Siegrist, Hartmann, & Keller, 2013; Skinner, Carruth, Bounds, & Ziegler, 2002). Therefore, it is important to measure food neophobia in humans in order to identify its antecedents and consequences, as well as effective intervention strategies to reduce it and change unhealthy consumption behavior. Many instruments have been developed for this purpose (for a review, cf. Damsbo-Svendsen, Frøst, & Olsen, 2017), but the Food Neophobia Scale (FNS, Pliner & Hobden, 1992) is still the most used measure of food neophobia in adults, probably because it is very specific. Indeed, the other measures are not specifically devoted to quantifying food neophobia, but rather more general or similar constructs (e.g., the Variety Seeking, or VARSEEK, Scale by van Trijp & Steenkamp, 1992) or a combination of constructs including food neophobia as a subscale (e.g., the Food and Eating Questionnaire by Raudenbush, van der

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118

1 Klaauw, & Frank, 1995). The FNS is also the only measure originally validated with a behavioral
2 test, and it has been repeatedly shown to predict actual responses to novel food (e.g., Hobden &
3 Pliner, 1995; Raudenbush & Frank, 1999; Raudenbush, Schroth, Reilley, & Frank, 1998).
4 Furthermore, the FNS is the only food neophobia measure that is completely balanced.

5 However, the FNS dates back to 1992, and its validation through confirmatory factor
6 analysis dates back to 2003 (Ritchey, Frank, Hursti, & Tuorila, 2003). For this reason, Damsbo-
7 Svendsen et al. (2017) suggested that some items in the FNS may no longer be relevant, stating that
8 a novel test of the FNS, focused on the critical assessment of the validity of its items and on the
9 unidimensionality of its structure, should be performed.

10 This is why, the present study aimed at testing the validity of the FNS in a wide convenience
11 sample of Italian adults. The validity of this scale nowadays was tested going through three steps.
12 First, its construct validity was tested using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and thus the
13 unsatisfactory items have been deleted. A 6-item Revised Food Neophobia Scale (FNS-R) resulted
14 from this initial step. Second, the concurrent validity of the FNS-R was analyzed by taking into
15 consideration the relation with the general neophobia and disgust sensitivity. Indeed, as neophobic
16 individuals tend to display a general reluctance to experience new situations, people and activities
17 (i.e., high level of general neophobia; Pliner & Hobden, 1992; Raudenbush et al., 1995), and a
18 dispositional inclination to experience the emotion of disgust (i.e., high disgust sensitivity; Al-
19 Shawaf, Lewis, Alley, & Buss, 2015; Björklund & Hursti, 2004; Nordin, Broman, Garvill, &
20 Nyroos, 2004), positive correlations between the FNS-R and both the General Neophobia Scale
21 (GNS; Pliner & Hobden, 1992) and the Contamination Disgust subscale of the Revised Disgust
22 Scale (DS-R; Olatunji et al., 2007, 2009) were expected. Finally, as a third step, the structural
23 invariance of the FNS-R across genders, age groups, levels of education, and method of
24 administration (online vs. paper-and-pencil questionnaire) was tested.

Method

Participants and procedure

Data for the present study were gathered along with data for other research purposes. Overall, 711 adults (69.6% females, aged 18–73 years, $M_{\text{age}} = 34.34$, $SD = 11.90$) took part in this research (an overview of their sociodemographic characteristics is displayed in Table 1). They were recruited mainly through snowball sampling on Facebook, but also through students' mailing lists. In addition, the present data included pre-school children's parents recruited through school principals and teachers. As data from different studies were merged, not all participants completed the same measures, except for the FNS. Every study, however, included some sociodemographic questions (age and gender) and psychological scales (based on the study, participants were asked about their personality, general neophobia, disgust sensitivity, death anxiety, sociopolitical attitudes, parenting styles, and willingness to taste a list of novel foods). The full questionnaires are available from the corresponding author. Most participants ($n = 603$) completed an online questionnaire, whereas the others ($n = 108$) filled in a paper-and-pencil questionnaire.

Table 1. Overview of participants' sociodemographic characteristics.

		18–39 years old	40–73 years old	Total
Education not asked	Males	43	8	51
	Females	88	17	105
Low education (≤ 13 years)	Males	56	50	106
	Females	145	65	210
High education (> 13 years)	Males	32	27	59
	Females	118	62	180
Total		482	229	711

2.1. Measures

After giving their informed consent, the participants completed the FNS (Pliner & Hobden, 1992). Respondents were asked to report the extent to which each of the 10 items described them,

178
179
180 1 using 5 response categories labeled at their extremes as 1 = *not at all descriptive of me* and 5 = *very*
181
182 2 *descriptive of me*. The items of the original scale and their Italian translations are reported in Table
183
184 3, in the Results section.
185

186
187 4 In the original scale answers were given on a 7-point agreement scale, but a 5-point scale was
188
189 5 preferred in the present study, as analyses based on the Item Response Theory (IRT; e.g., Lambert
190
191 6 et al., 2013; Pallant & Tennant, 2007; Tennant & Conhagan, 2007) consistently show that using 7
192
193 7 categories leads to the inclusion of non-discriminant response options, thus reducing the validity of
194
195 8 the scale (e.g., Roccato, Rosato, Mosso, & Russo, 2014). In addition, the usual agreement response
196
197 9 options was replaced with the above-reported anchors that fit better with the items content and
198
199 10 make the questions less ambiguous (Schuman & Presser, 1981).
200

201
202 11 A subsample of 448 respondents (73.0% females, $M_{\text{age}} = 34.80$ years, $SD = 12.81$, range =
203
204 12 18–73) also filled in the other two scales used to test the concurrent validity of the FNS: the General
205
206 13 Neophobia Scale (GNS; 8 items; Pliner & Hobden, 1992) and the Contamination Disgust subscale
207
208 14 from the DS-R (5 items; Olatunji et al., 2007, 2009). Only the latter subscale was administer based
209
210 15 on preliminary analyses conducted on a subsample of 264 participants who completed the whole
211
212 16 25-item DS-R, showing that when the three factors (core disgust, animal-reminder, and
213
214 17 contamination disgust) of the DS-R were entered as predictors in a linear regression predicting food
215
216 18 neophobia, only contamination disgust reached statistical significance ($\beta = .29$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .11$).
217

218
219 19 Both the GNS and the Contamination Disgust subscale were administered with a 5-category
220
221 20 format. For the GNF and the first 2 items of the Contamination Disgust subscale, participants had to
222
223 21 report the extent to which each item described them, using the same response scale used for the
224
225 22 FNS. For the remaining 3 items of the Contamination Disgust subscale, participants had to rate how
226
227 23 disgusting each described situation would be on a 5-response scale labeled at its extremes as 1 = *not*
228
229 24 *at all disgusting* and 5 = *extremely disgusting*. Finally, for all participants, a standard
230
231 25 sociodemographic form followed, asking about their gender and age (70.3% females, $M_{\text{age}} = 35.71$
232
233
234
235
236

237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295

1 years, *SD* = 11.79, range = 18–73). The level of education was asked to 555 participants, and
2 recoded into years of formal education

3 **Data analyses**

4 The validity of the FNS was analyzed via a threefold procedure. First, its construct validity
5 was analyzed via a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), performed using AMOS 20.0 (extraction:
6 ML). The scale would have been considered valid only if it was unidimensional. Second, after
7 ascertaining its construct validity, the concurrent validity of the scale was tested via two structural
8 equations models (SEMs) aimed at analyzing its correlation with the GNS (Pliner & Hobden, 1992)
9 and the Contamination Disgust subscale from the DS-R (Olatunji et al, 2007, 2009). All of these
10 constructs were measured as latent variables, using the items of the questionnaires as their manifest
11 indicators. The scale would have been considered valid only if it showed positive, significant
12 correlations with general neophobia and sensitivity to contamination disgust. The a priori α level to
13 evaluate the significance of these associations was set to 0.05. The sample size was large enough to
14 conduct a factor analysis on each scale, in that the participants-to-item ratio was much higher than
15 the 12:1 usually considered as the standard threshold (see Byrne, 2012). Consistent with Hu and
16 Bentler’s (1998) suggestions, different indexes were combined to evaluate the fit of these models.
17 Based on Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, and Barlow (2006), the Tucker–Lewis coefficient (*TLI*:
18 Tucker & Lewis, 1973), the comparative fit index (*CFI*: Bentler, 1990), and the root mean square
19 error of approximation (*RMSEA*: Steiger, 1980) were chosen. Based on Bentler (1990) and Browne
20 (1990), the *CFI* and the *TLI* were considered as satisfactory if higher than .90. Moreover, based on
21 Browne and Cudeck (1993), the *RMSEA* was considered good if lower than 0.05 and fair if ranging
22 between 0.05 and 0.08. With the exception of the test of the structural invariance of the FNS-R (see
23 below), even if it was reported the χ^2 of the models was not taken into consideration, because such
24 an index heavily depends on the *N* of the dataset.

25 After ascertaining the validity of the FNS-R, its structural invariance across genders, age
26 groups, levels of education, and method of administration was tested employing Reise, Widaman,

296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354

1 and Pugh's (1993) approach. Starting with gender, a baseline (B) model was tested simultaneously
2 on both gender groups. Subsequently, an invariant (I) model was tested, fixing all of the factor
3 loadings and the correlations between the errors of the con-trait items to be equal among men ($n =$
4 216) and women ($n = 495$). The hypothesis of invariance would have been accepted if constraining
5 the parameters to invariance would have not determined a significant worsening in the model fit,
6 i.e., if the difference between the χ^2 of the I model and that of the B model was not significant for a
7 number of degrees of freedom equal to the difference in degrees of freedom of the two models. The
8 same procedure was repeated, subdividing the sample into groups based on age (low level = less
9 than 40 years, $n = 482$; high level = at least 40 years, $n = 229$), education (low level = not more than
10 13 years of formal education, $n = 316$; high level = more than 13 years of formal education, $n =$
11 239), and method of administration (online: $n = 603$; paper-and-pencil: $n = 108$).

Results

13 In spite of the very good alpha of the scale, $\alpha = .89$, a first CFA on the 10-item FNS did not
14 show an adequate fit to the data: $\chi^2(35) = 335.32, p < .001, TLI = .45, CFI = .49, RMSEA = .11$
15 (90% CI: .10-.12). Unsatisfactory results such as this may occur even when genuinely
16 unidimensional balanced scales are subjected to confirmatory factor analysis, as a consequence of
17 the partial distortion of the data stemming from response-sets, mainly from acquiescence (cf.
18 Winkler, Kanouse, & Ware, 1982). To correct for this method distortion, Marsh's (1989) correlated
19 uniqueness approach was employed. This approach states that when a latent variable is measured
20 via a balanced scale, the error variance stemming from response-sets should be statistically
21 controlled for by correlating the errors of the con-trait items. However, even with this correction,
22 the fit of the model was unsatisfactory: $\chi^2(25) = 286.76, p < .001, TLI = .85, CFI = .92, RMSEA =$
23 .12 (90% CI: .11-.13). Nevertheless, the modification indexes showed that the inclusion of items 3
24 ('If I don't know what a food is, I won't try it'), 4 ('I like foods from different cultures'), 8 ('I am
25 very particular about the foods I eat'), and 9 ('I will eat almost anything') lowered the fit of the

scale. A new analysis, performed after deleting them and correcting for the method factor (i.e., correlating the errors of the con-trait items), showed that the obtained 6-item scale ($\alpha = .84$) was definitely unidimensional: $\chi^2(6) = 30.02, p < .001, TLI = .96, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .07$ (90% CI: .05–.10). All factor loadings were significant with $p < .001$ and, when standardized, ranged between .57 and .78 (see Figure 1). The other indexes provided by Amos (available on request) were satisfactory as well. For the sake of brevity, we do not report on them. To conclude, these analyses spoke in favor of the construct validity of the FNS-R.




Figure 1. Confirmatory factor analysis of the FNS-R (standardized parameters are displayed).

Subsequent confirmatory factor analyses showed that, despite a satisfactory $\alpha = .83$, the GNS did not show a unidimensional structure: $\chi^2(8) = 250.31, p < .001, TLI = .83, CFI = .88, RMSEA = .13$ (90% CI: .12–.14). However, its fit became acceptable, $\chi^2(5) = 20.75, p < .001, TLI = .96, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .08$ (90% CI: .05–.12), with standardized factor loadings ranging from .45 to .84, and

414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472

1 all $ps < .001$, after deleting items 1 ('I feel uncomfortable when I find myself in novel situations'), 2
2 ('Whenever I'm away, I want to get home to my familiar surroundings') and 3 ('I am afraid of the
3 unknown'). The alpha of the resulting battery was satisfactory: $\alpha = .81$.

4 Similarly, in spite of its satisfactory $\alpha = .84$, when modeled as a unidimensional construct the
5 Contamination Disgust subscale did not show a completely satisfactory fit: $\chi^2(5) = 42.41, p < .001$,
6 $TLI = .94, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .10$ (90% CI: .08–.13). However, the scale was definitely
7 unidimensional after deleting the item 'As part of a sex education class, you are required to inflate a
8 new unlubricated condom, using your mouth,' $\chi^2(2) = 3.05, p = .22, TLI = .99, CFI = .99, RMSEA =$
9 $.03$ (90% CI: .00–.08), with standardized factor loadings ranging from .47 to .72, and all $ps < .001$.
10 The resulting battery showed a satisfactory alpha: $\alpha = .82$. Two SEMs showed that, as expected, the
11 FNS correlated positively both with the GNS, $r = .34, p < .001, \chi^2(73) = 251.76, p < .001, TLI =$
12 $.90, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .07$ (90% CI: .06–.07), and Contamination Disgust, $r = .19, p < .001,$
13 $\chi^2(31) = 64.11, p < .001, TLI = .98, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .04$ (90% CI: .03–.05).

14 Table 2 reports results of the structural invariance tests of the FNS-R. In all cases, the
15 hypothesis of invariance was accepted. Thus, the factor loadings of the FNS-R were invariant across
16 genders, age groups, levels of education, and methods of administration.

17 Table 3 reports the original and the translated items of the FNS. The items of the FNS-R are
18 in bold.

1 Table 2. Test of the invariance of the FNS-R across gender, age groups, level of education, and
 2 methods of scale administration.

		χ^2	df	<i>P</i>	<i>TLI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i> (90% CI)	χ^2 difference
Gender (men's <i>n</i> = 216; women's <i>n</i> = 495)	Baseline model	41.46	12	.000	.95	.98	.06 (.04–.08)	
	Invariant model	46.62	17	.000	.97	.98	.05 (.03–.07)	$\chi^2(5) = 5.16, p = .40$
Age groups (≤ 40 years olds' <i>n</i> = 482; > 40 years olds' <i>n</i> = 229)	Baseline model	35.66	12	.000	.96	.99	.05 (.03–.07)	
	Invariant model	40.40	17	.001	.97	.99	.04 (.03–.06)	$\chi^2(5) = 4.74, p = .45$
Level of education (≤ 13 years <i>n</i> = 316; > 13 years <i>n</i> = 239)	Baseline model	18.69	12	.10	.99	1.00	.03 (.00–.05)	
	Invariant model	22.22	17	.18	.99	1.00	.02 (.00–.04)	$\chi^2(5) = 3.53, p = .62$
Methods of administration (online <i>n</i> = 603; paper- and-pencil <i>n</i> = 108)	Baseline model	36.24	12	.000	.96	.99	.05 (.03–.07)	
	Invariant model	51.24	20	.000	.97	.98	.05 (.03–.06)	$\chi^2(8) = 15.00, p = .06$

Table 3. Original items of the FNS and Italian translation.

1. I am constantly sampling new and different foods (R)	Assaggio sempre cibi nuovi e diversi (R)
2. I don't trust new foods	Non mi fido dei cibi nuovi
3. If I don't know what a food is, I won't try it	Se non so cosa c'è in una pietanza non la provo
4. I like foods from different cultures (R)	Mi piacciono cibi di diversi paesi (R)
5. Ethnic food looks too weird to eat	Il cibo etnico sembra strano
6. At dinner parties, I will try new foods (R)	Durante le feste sarei disposto a provare cibi nuovi (R)
7. I am afraid to eat things I have never had before	Ho paura di mangiare cibo mai provato prima
8. I am very particular about the foods I eat	Per quando riguarda il cibo che mangio mi reputo una persona difficile
9. I will eat almost anything (R)	Mangio quasi tutto (R)
10. I like to try new ethnic restaurants (R)	Mi piace provare nuovi ristoranti etnici (R)

Note. 'R' stands for 'reverse item.'

Discussion

The FNS is a widely used instrument for the measurement of the reluctance to try novel foods (e.g., Arvola, Lähteenmäki, & Tuorila, 1999; Rigal, Frelut, Monneuse, Hladik, Simmen, & Pasquet, 2006; Stratton, Vella, Sheeshka, & Duncan, 2015). However, its psychometric properties needed to be re-examined because of the contextual changes that made new foods much more available and salient than ever. Therefore, the current study aimed to test the validity of the FNS in a wide convenience sample of Italian adults. In addition to testing the construct validity, it aimed at demonstrating concurrent validity through positive relations with the general neophobia orientation

591
592
593 1 (GNS) and disgust sensitivity (DS-R). Finally, the FNS was expected to be structurally invariant
594
595 2 across genders, age groups, levels of education, and methods of administration.
596

597 3 While confirmatory factor analyses revealed mediocre fits for the original 10-item version, a
598 4 shortened 6-item version (i.e., the FNS-R scale), in which four items with a suboptimal association
599
600 5 with the other items of the scale have been deleted and the acquiescent response-set was corrected,
601
602 6 displayed a completely satisfactory fit. From the substantive point of view, the four items that
603
604 7 lowered the fit of the scale did not appear truly pertinent to food neophobia in the strictest sense.
605
606 8 Indeed, items 3 ('If I don't know what a food is, I won't try it'), 8 ('I am very particular about the
607
608 9 foods I eat'), and 9 ('I will eat almost anything') could not discriminate between neophobic
609
610 10 individuals and picky eaters (who reject a large amount of both familiar and novel foods),
611
612 11 vegans/vegetarians, and intolerant/allergic people. Consistent with this, in a large representative
613
614 12 sample of Finns, these three items were found to load on a second factor explaining only 7.7% of
615
616 13 the scale variance (Tuorila, Lähteenmäki, Pohjalainen, & Lotti, 2001). In addition, item 4 ('I like
617
618 14 foods from different cultures') refers to liking and thus implies that those foods have already been
619
620 15 tasted and are no longer novel, whereas 'the concept of food neophobia only extends to the point
621
622 16 where the individual picks up the food and places it in his mouth' (Dovey, Staples, Gibson, &
623
624 17 Halford, 2008, p. 185).
625
626
627
628

629 18 Therefore, the removal of these four items represented an improvement of the measure, as it
630
631 19 should be more focused and thus more sensitive to the construct of interest. This is not to say that
632
633 20 results previously stemming from the full Pliner and Hobden (1992) scale were no longer valuable.
634
635 21 However, as food neophobia is often considered a subset of the picky eating phenomenon (Dovey et
636
637 22 al., 2008) and not the reverse, eliminating the potential confusion with pickiness could produce
638
639 23 larger magnitude effects. Further research aimed to test this hypothesis will be welcome. In
640
641 24 addition, as compared to the FNS, the FNS-R is likely to be more useful for studying the actual
642
643 25 interplay between food neophobia and pickiness. Indeed, the issue of picky eating in adulthood,
644
645 26 thus far under-investigated, has been recently drawing scholars' attention (Kauer, Pelchat, Rozin, &
646
647
648
649

650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708

1 Zickgraf, 2015; Wildes, Zucker, & Marcus, 2012), and a measure addressing this construct has been
2 newly developed (Zickgraf & Ellis, 2018).

3 Overall, the 6-item FNS-R focused on the conceptual core of food neophobia, is fully
4 balanced and an internally consistent, valid, and reliable measure that can be used to assess an
5 individual's orientation toward new food. Moreover, its parameters were invariant according to
6 participants' gender, age, and education, and according to the method used to administer it.
7 Therefore, the FNS-R is preferable to the original FNS for at least four main reasons.

8 First of all, it has been subjected to more diagnostic and severe psychometric tests on its
9 factorial structure, going well beyond the classic analysis of the scale's α and/or its
10 unidimensionality as stemming from exploratory factor analysis (Pliner & Hobden, 1992; Ritchey et
11 al., 2003).

12 Second, it displayed a good convergent validity, showing the expected associations with
13 general neophobia and sensitivity to contamination disgust. The fact that the convergent validity of
14 the scale was tested via the SEM approach was definitely a plus of this study, in that it allowed to
15 test the models' fit to the data even when correlating the FNS-R with the other variables taken into
16 consideration.

17 The third strong point for the FNS-R is related to its length. Indeed, it is shorter than the
18 original scale. The methodological literature converges showing that the longer the scales, the
19 higher the probability of having results distorted by the acquiescent response-set, especially when
20 interviewing samples extracted from the general population and/or in suboptimal settings (e.g.,
21 Schuman & Presser, 1981). It could be objected that a 10-item scale is not that long, but the present
22 analyses showed some symptoms of the acquiescent response-set even in these short scales.
23 Moreover, it is apparent that future researchers will measure food neophobia in association with
24 other variables, thus adding more items. The use of psychometrically solid, as-short-as-possible
25 scales is definitely a fundamental goal of researchers interested in overcoming the 'student sample
26 bias' (Meloan, 1993), according to which substantive research is performed with culturally

709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767

1 privileged student samples, thus undermining the generalizability of the results. The FNS-R
2 definitely goes in that direction.

3 Finally, the fourth strong point of the FNS-R is related to its structural invariance across
4 participants' main sociodemographic variables and, even more importantly, across methods of
5 administration. It is apparent that the value of a measurement models depends, at least in part, on its
6 replicability across different groups – i.e., if it shows the same psychometric properties across
7 different subsamples, defined according to substantive and/or methodologic criteria (Sass &
8 Schmitt, 2013). One of the 'new frontiers' of survey research is definitely the web approach, which
9 allows the researcher to interview large samples from the general population at minimum expense
10 in terms of time and money (e.g., Callegaro et al., 2014). The FNS-R was adequate for online
11 administration and thus could be used, even beyond the standard data collection approaches, in web
12 surveys.

13 A specific comment on the analytical approach used in this paper is germane. Thanks to SEM
14 approach, it was possible to go beyond the often-used, often-insufficiently-diagnostic standard
15 approach, in five senses. First, it allowed to measure the constructs while statistically correcting the
16 random measurement error, thus gaining much more precise estimates of such constructs and of
17 their correlations with other variables. Second, it showed that a scale with a good α needed a
18 relevant trimming of its items to pass the severe fit test of the genuine modeling approach. Third, it
19 allowed to detect some symptoms of distortion stemming from the acquiescent response-set and to
20 correct for it statistically. Fourth, it helped to formally test the fit of the models to the analyzed data
21 . Fifth, and as a byproduct, it allowed to do the first steps for an Italian validation of a short version
22 of the General Neophobia Scale and of the Contamination Disgust subscale of the DS-R.

23 Beyond its strong points, this research also had some limitations. First, the sample was not
24 statistically representative of the Italian population: Among participants, women and young people
25 were over-represented. In addition, as these data were drawn from different studies, about one-fifth
26 of participants were not asked about their education, thus there was no information on their overlap

768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826

1 with the rest of the sample. However, the invariance across sociodemographic categories suggests
2 that these sample biases should not undermine the FNS-R validity. Nonetheless, a repetition of this
3 study on a more representative sample of the Italian population could be interesting. Moreover, as it
4 systematically happens in Italian research (see Roccato, 2006), socioeconomic status (SES) was not
5 directly measured; instead, education as a proxy of SES was measured, as income-related questions
6 are sensitive issues in Italy, heavily distorted by social desirability. Future research, performed in
7 contexts where people feel freer to declare their social status, such as the USA, will be welcome.
8 However, even before these possible developments, the present study provided a convincing revised
9 version of the most used measure of food neophobia and could be an important reference point for
10 additional research.

827
828
829 **References**
830

- 831 2 Al-Shawaf, L., Lewis, D. M., Alley, T. R., & Buss, D. M. (2015). Mating strategy, disgust, and
832 2 food neophobia. *Appetite*, *85*, 30-35.
833 3
834 3
835 4 Arvola, A., Lähteenmäki, L., & Tuorila, H. (1999). Predicting the intent to purchase unfamiliar and
836 4 familiar cheeses: the effects of attitudes, expected liking and food neophobia. *Appetite*,
837 5
838 5 familiar cheeses: the effects of attitudes, expected liking and food neophobia. *Appetite*,
839 6
840 6 32(1), 113-126.
841 7
842 7 Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*,
843 8
844 8 238-246.
845 9
846 9 Björklund, F., & Hursti, T. J. (2004). A Swedish translation and validation of the Disgust Scale: A
847 10
848 10 measure of disgust sensitivity. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *45*, 279-284.
849 11
850 11 Browne, M. W. (1990). *MUTMUM PC: User's guide*. Columbus: Ohio State University,
851 12
852 12 Department of Psychology.
853 13
854 13 Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J.
855 14
856 14 S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
857 15
858 15 Byrne, B. M. (2012). *Structural equation modeling with M Plus: Basic concepts, applications, and*
859 16
860 16 *programming*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
861 17
862 17 Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Goritz, A. S., Krosnik, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.)
863 18
864 18 (2014). *Online panel research: A data quality perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
865 19
866 19 Damsbo-Svendsen, M., Frøst, M. B., & Olsen, A. (2017). A review of instruments developed to
867 20
868 20 measure food neophobia. *Appetite*, *113*, 358-367.
869 21
870 21 Dovey, T. M., Staples, P. A., Gibson, E. L., & Halford, J. C. (2008). Food neophobia and
871 22
872 22 'picky/fussy' eating in children: A review. *Appetite*, *50*, 181-193.
873 23
874 23 Hobden, K., & Pliner, P. (1995). Effects of a model on food neophobia in humans. *Appetite*, *25*,
875 24
876 24 101-114.
877 25
878 25 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to
879 26
880 26 undeparametrized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, *3*, 424-453.
881
882
883
884
885

886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944

1 Kauer, J., Pelchat, M. L., Rozin, P., & Zickgraf, H. F. (2015). Adult picky eating. Phenomenology,
2 taste sensitivity, and psychological correlates. *Appetite*, 90, 219-228.

3 Lambert, S. D., Pallant, J. F., Boyes, A. W., King, M. T., Britton, B., & Girgis, A. (2013). A Rasch
4 analysis of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) among cancer survivors.
5 *Psychological Assessment*, 25, 379-390.

6 Marsh, H. W. (1989). Confirmatory factor analyses of multitrait-multimethod data: Many problems
7 and a few solutions. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 13, 335-361.

8 Meloen, J. (1993). The F scale as predictor of fasism: An overview of 40 years of authoritarianism
9 research. In W. F. Stone, G. Lederer, & R. Christie (Eds.), *Strength and weakness: The*
10 *Authoritarian Personality today* (pp. 47-69). New York, NY: Springer.

11 Nordin, S., Broman, D. A., Garvill, J., & Nyroos, M. (2004). Gender differences in factors affecting
12 rejection of food in healthy young Swedish adults. *Appetite*, 43, 295-301.

13 Olatunji, B. O., Moretz, M. W., McKay, D., Bjorklund, F., de Jong, P. J., Haidt, J., ... & Page, A. C.
14 (2009). Confirming the three-factor structure of the disgust scale-revised in eight countries.
15 *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40, 234-255.

16 Olatunji, B. O., Williams, N. L., Tolin, D. F., Abramowitz, J. S., Sawchuk, C. N., Lohr, J. M., &
17 Elwood, L. S. (2007). The Disgust Scale: Item analysis, factor structure, and suggestions for
18 refinement. *Psychological Assessment*, 19, 281-297.

19 Pallant, J. F., & Tennant, A. (2007). An introduction to the Rasch measurement model: an example
20 using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). *British Journal of Clinical*
21 *Psychology*, 46, 1-18.

22 Pliner, P., & Hobden, K. (1992). Development of a scale to measure the trait of food neophobia in
23 humans. *Appetite*, 19, 105-120.

24 Raudenbush, B., & Frank, R. A. (1999). Assessing food neophobia: The role of stimulus
25 familiarity. *Appetite*, 32, 261-271.

945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003

- 1 Raudenbush, B., Schroth, F., Reilley, S., & Frank, R. A. (1998). Food neophobia, odor evaluation
2 and exploratory sniffing behavior. *Appetite*, *31*, 171-183.
- 3 Raudenbush, B., Van Der Klaauw, N. J., & Frank, R. A. (1995). The contribution of psychological
4 and sensory factors to food preference patterns as measured by the Food Attitudes Survey
5 (FAS). *Appetite*, *25*, 1-15.
- 6 Reise, S. P., Widaman, K. F., & Pugh, R. H. (1993). Confirmatory factor analysis and item response
7 theory: Two approaches for exploring measurement invariance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*,
8 552-566.
- 9 Rigal, N., Frelut, M. L., Monneuse, M. O., Hladik, C. M., Simmen, B., & Pasquet, P. (2006). Food
10 neophobia in the context of a varied diet induced by a weight reduction program in
11 massively obese adolescents. *Appetite*, *46*(2), 207-214.
- 12 Ritchey, P. N., Frank, R. A., Hursti, U. K., & Tuorila, H. (2003). Validation and cross-national
13 comparison of the food neophobia scale (FNS) using confirmatory factor
14 analysis. *Appetite*, *40*, 163-173.
- 15 Roccato, M. (2006). *L'inchiesta e il sondaggio nella ricerca psicosociale* [Surveys and polls in
16 social-psychological research]. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- 17 Roccato, M., Rosato, R., Mosso, C., & Russo, S. (2014). Measurement properties of the system
18 justification scale: A Rasch analysis. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied
19 Psychology*, *21*, 467-478.
- 20 Rozin, P. (1976). The evolution of intelligence and access to the cognitive unconscious. *Progress in
21 Psychobiology and Physiological Psychology*, *6*, 245-280.
- 22 Rozin, P., & Millman, L. (1987). Family environment, not heredity, accounts for family
23 resemblances in food preferences and attitudes: A twin study. *Appetite*, *8*, 125-134.
- 24 Rozin, P., & Vollmecke, T. A. (1986). Food likes and dislikes. *Annual Review of Nutrition*, *6*, 433-
25 456.

1004
1005
1006 1 Sass, D. A., & Schmitt, T. A. (2013). Testing measurement and structural invariance: Implications
1007
1008 2 for practice. In T. Teo (Ed.), *Handbook of quantitative methods for educational research*
1009
1010 3 (pp. 315-346). Rotterdam: Sense.
1012
1013 4 Schuman, H., & Presser, S. (1981). *Questions and answers: Experiments on question form,*
1014
1015 5 *wording, and context in attitude surveys*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
1016
1017 6 Siegrist, M., Hartmann, C., & Keller, C. (2013). Antecedents of food neophobia and its association
1018
1019 7 with eating behavior and food choices. *Food Quality and Preference, 30*, 293-298.
1020
1021 8 Skinner, J. D., Carruth, B. R., Bounds, W., & Ziegler, P. J. (2002). Children's food preferences: a
1022
1023 9 longitudinal analysis. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 102*, 1638-1647.
1024
1025 10 Steiger, J. H. (1980). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation
1026
1027 11 approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*, 173-180.
1029
1030 12 Stratton, L. M., Vella, M. N., Sheeshka, J., & Duncan, A. M. (2015). Food neophobia is related to
1031
1032 13 factors associated with functional food consumption in older adults. *Food quality and*
1033
1034 14 *preference, 41*, 133-140.
1035
1036 15 Tennant, A., & Conaghan, P. G. (2007). The Rasch measurement model in rheumatology: what is it
1037
1038 16 and why use it? When should it be applied, and what should one look for in a Rasch paper?
1039
1040 17 *Arthritis Care & Research, 57*, 1358-1362.
1041
1042 18 Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis.
1043
1044 19 *Psychometrika, 38*, 1-10.
1046
1047 20 Tuorila, H., Lähteenmäki, L., Pohjalainen, L., & Lotti, L. (2001). Food neophobia among the Finns
1048
1049 21 and related responses to familiar and unfamiliar foods. *Food Quality and Preference, 12*, 29-
1050
1051 22 37.
1052
1053 23 Van Trijp, H. C., & Steenkamp, J. B. E. (1992). Consumers' variety seeking tendency with respect
1054
1055 24 to foods: measurement and managerial implications. *European Review of Agricultural*
1056
1057 25 *Economics, 19*, 181-195.
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062

1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121

1 Wildes, J. E., Zucker, N. L., & Marcus, M. D. (2012). Picky eating in adults: Results of a
2 web-based survey. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 45(4), 575-582.

3 Winkler, J. D., Kanouse, D. E., & Ware, L. E., Jr. (1982). Controlling for acquiescence response set
4 in scale development. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 555-561.

5 Zickgraf, H. F., & Ellis, J. M. (2018). Initial validation of the Nine Item Avoidant/Restrictive Food
6 Intake disorder screen (NIAS): A measure of three restrictive eating patterns. *Appetite*, 123,
7 32-42.

Validation of the revised Food Neophobia Scale (FNS-R) in the Italian context

Margherita Guidetti^a, Luciana Carraro^b, Nicoletta Cavazza^a, Michele Roccatò^c

^aUniversità di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy

^bUniversità di Padova, Italy

^cUniversità di Torino, Italy

Corresponding author: Margherita Guidetti (margherita.guidetti@gmail.com)