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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report includes findings from online surveys tracking the dietary habits, goals, perceived barriers, and motivators for participants in seven reduction and vegan campaigns in the UK over a six-month period. This includes the largest sample of meat reducers, pescatarians, vegetarians, and vegans (veg*ns) in any research project to date (n=1,587) and also includes findings from participant focus groups (n=33) and interviews with campaign staff members (n=13).

Key Findings

- Most participants (57%) were meeting their reduction goals at six months, including 12% who had surpassed their initial goals.
  - 71% reported eating less or no meat at six months.
  - Those with the strictest goals (i.e. vegans) were the most likely to be meeting their reduction goals (78%), while meat reducers were the least likely (39%).
  - While meat reducers were more likely to reduce than not in the first month, the reverse was true afterward, with 54% being temporary reducers at six months, 36% long-term reducers and 10% no longer consuming meat.
  - Those in vegan campaigns tended to reduce more and were more likely to exceed their initial reduction goals.

- Most reduction campaign participants were meat reducers, while those in vegan campaigns were mostly vegetarians, pescatarians, or meat reducers.

- Reductions tended to be gradual and follow The Reduction Hierarchy, emphasizing red then white meat, dairy, fish, and eggs. For planned abstention, fish tended to precede that of dairy or eggs. Many participants also planned to eat more fish and eggs.

- Campaign populations were lacking in diversity, with participants extremely likely to be female, university educated, and middle to high-income.
  - Vegan campaigns tended to draw a greater proportion of younger participants, while reduction campaigns tended to include more men.

- Participants generally described barriers as unobtrusive (i.e. as opportunities for dietary transition).
  - Social barriers emerged as particularly impactful, especially for new vegans, who could experience stigma, negative reactions from friends and family, and feelings of unease when seeing others consume animal food products (AFPs). Conversely, veg*n communities could present important sources of support, skills, and knowledge.
  - Continuing consumers (i.e. reducers) tended to struggle more with forming veg*n habits, potentially due to their maintenance of omnivorous norms and routines.

- Animal protection emerged as the most impactful motivator, leading to greater reductions and meeting of reduction goals than other motivators.
  - Those motivated by animals could experience a vegan mindshift, where animal-based foods came to embody suffering and death and were thus considered completely outside of the realm of potential food items.
  - Environment and health motivators were also prominent, but were most effective as secondary motivators when animal protection was a primary motivator.

- Dietary transitions were ultimately highly individual and context-dependent, suggesting the potential for more tailored campaigns that address individuals’ current level of motivation and dietary habits.

Within this sample, it appears that campaigns can serve a variety of purposes. For instance, while some vegan campaigns drew a majority of participants who planned to become vegan, others didn’t. In addition, despite vegan campaign participants being more likely to meet their reduction goals, some reducers seemed unlikely to consider a vegan campaign or may have struggled with a more drastic dietary change. Reduction campaigns may be most effective when using a clear goal and stepped approach leading to future abstentions. Ultimately, successful dietary change is likely to be related to changes in unconscious habits and dietary norms, where transitioners don’t just eat fewer animal-derived foods, but actively embrace a new way of eating.
INTRODUCTION

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON MEAT REDUCTION AND VEG*NISM

The proportion of the British population reducing their consumption of animal food products (AFPs) has increased dramatically over the last decade, while vegetarian and vegan options are now widely available in supermarkets and restaurants across the UK. Recent estimates found that 44% of Brits reported eating less meat, while 2 to 3% were vegetarian or vegan (veg*n). Furthering the increased prevalence of reducers and abstainers is essential for future sustainability, while presenting significant benefits for animals, the environment, and human health.

While governments remain hesitant to change dietary practices through political interventions, non-profit campaigns remain a primary promoter of AFP reduction and abstention (i.e. veg*nism). However, little research has investigated the effectiveness of these campaigns or examined reducers’ and abstainers’ journeys, including how their diets change and their perceived motivators and barriers to such changes. Previous research has found animal and health-related motivators may be the most popular. While a variety of potential barriers to reduction have been identified (e.g. taste, availability, and awareness), previous findings have been inconclusive in regards to which may be most impactful to potential reducers and which may be easiest to address in a campaign context.

Dietary transitions present a complex and difficult form of behavior change. While most behavior change models focus on a rational approach (i.e. assuming that gaining awareness is enough to change behavior), people’s individual belief systems and ethics are not often reflected in their actions due to the “Value-Action Gap.” In the case of AFP consumption, consumers face “The Meat Paradox,” continuing to enjoy consuming meat (and other animal-derived foods) despite caring for animals.

It is essential to increase our understanding of and ability to address the specific barriers inhibiting these dietary changes. The “Behaviour Change Wheel” (a.k.a. “The Wheel”) presents the most comprehensive framework for such research and includes direct links between sources of behavior (i.e. barriers), intervention functions (i.e. campaign strategies), and policy.
The Wheel envisions behavior as being influenced by three components:

1. **Capability**: the *ability* to change a specific behavior, including *physical* (i.e. physical skill, stamina, or strength) and *psychological* (i.e. ability and skills to engage in mental processes or knowledge) elements.

2. **Opportunity**: the external environment, including *physical* (i.e. what is allowed for or facilitated in the external world, such as time or resources) and *social* (i.e. cultural norms or social cues) components.

3. **Motivation**: *reflective* (i.e. personal beliefs about what is good or bad) and *automatic* (e.g. wants, needs, or desires) drivers.

### Reflective Motivation
- Awareness of reasons to reduce (e.g. animal protection, health, or the environment)

### Automatic Motivation
- Identity as a meat eater; negative associations with veg*n identities
- Taste
- Novelty (willingness to try new foods)
- Habits

### Psychological Capabilities
- Health perceptions (e.g. that meat is a necessary source of protein)
- Knowledge (how to cook or find veg*n recipes or foods)

### Physical Opportunities
- Cost
- Availability; convenience

### Social Opportunities
- Whether friends / family are veg*n
- Reactions and opinions of friends / family
- Culture; tradition
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research project was designed and conducted by Dr. Trent Grassian as part of his PhD program, with oversight and full ethical approval by the University of Kent. A mixed-methods approach was used to allow for a large sampling strategy at multiple points over a prolonged period of time (six months) that included the depth of specific experiences, areas of conflicting opinion, and campaign design.

Six UK-based organizations featuring seven different reduction and vegan campaigns agreed to participate in the research project (see p. 5). Participants were given the opportunity to complete an initial online survey at the start of each campaign and then received follow up surveys at one, three, and six months. After data cleaning, 1,587 respondents were included from the initial survey. For longitudinal data analysis, those who did not provide an email address (and therefore could not be tracked over time) were excluded, leaving 1,538 at zero months, 739 at one month, 520 at three months, and 531 at six months. To minimize bias, changes over time are only discussed for samples that answered both surveys at the points of time being measured.

Surveys included four types of questions:
1. **Dietary habits**: reported changes from the previous six months, a food-frequency questionnaire from the past two days, and planned changes for the upcoming six months.
2. **Reduction motivators**, including: animal welfare, the environment, health, financial (i.e. to save money), food safety, religion, or other.
3. **Reduction barriers**: twenty questions measured via a 7-point Likert scale evaluated perceived barriers regarding willingness to try new foods, habits, health, knowledge (i.e. knowing “how” to find / prepare veg*n foods), awareness (i.e. not being aware of reasons to eat fewer animal-based foods), cost, availability, social (i.e. responses by friends / family), and taste.
4. **Sociodemographic characteristics**: country of residence, income, gender, and ethnicity.

Campaign participants were also invited to attend one of five focus groups held throughout the UK (n=33), which served to triangulate survey data and add additional depth. Questions focused on the same topics as those within the survey, with opportunities to share personal stories and perceptions. Participants are identified by the focus group they attended, followed by their participant number (e.g. BR for the Brighton focus group).

The third set of data includes interviews with campaign staff (n=13) to better understand the campaigns themselves (e.g. their design and maintenance) and add an additional layer in evaluating the process of dietary transition.

A meat reducer is defined as someone who consumes red and/or white meat but reports eating no meat or fewer servings than at the baseline (time zero). In the initial survey, meat reducers are those who report eating meat but having reduced red and/or white meat in the previous six months. As this project focuses on dietary change, a vegan refers to someone following a vegan diet and does not include other components of a vegan lifestyle.
LIMITATIONS

It is important to recognize that the purposes and construction of this mixed-methods research project are unlikely to be generalizable to the wider population. In addition, as most participants coming from two campaigns — with one being a vegan animal protection campaign and the other an environmental reduction campaign — findings may not be applicable to other types of campaigns. As such, analysis does not include tests of statistical significance or other attempts to generalize findings. Instead, data is used to raise important questions about the nature of the process of changing one’s diet, while identifying potential trends and areas of variation. Unnecessary or inappropriate generalizations have been avoided in discussing findings.

As within any data sample, bias is an important consideration. In longitudinal research, nonresponse bias is of particular import (e.g. Friedman et al. 2017). To minimize retention bias impacting response rates, individual reduction was used as a basis, instead of comparing average consumption levels at each point. Thus, reduction levels from zero to six months were calculated for only those who completed both surveys. This method minimizes retention bias and increases the validity of inter-point comparisons. The use of a single lottery prize and the particular distribution methods (i.e. repeated invitations on different days to each survey with the mention of the raffle in the subject line) were also utilized to assist in minimizing nonresponse bias.

The potential influence of nonresponse bias was evaluated by comparing dietary categories and means for all initial responses used in longitudinal analysis (n=1,538) to initial responses from only those who completed each wave. As expected, there is a minimal amount of bias, with participants completing the three and six month surveys more likely to consume or plan to consume a vegetarian diet and less likely to plan to be a meat reducer. Respondents to later waves also tended to be consuming slightly lower average amounts of AFPs, by category. For instance, within the entire sample at zero months 18% were non-reducers, 43% meat reducers, 12% pescatarians, 22% vegetarians, and 5% vegan. In the zero month survey, those who completed the six month survey included (at zero months): 15% non-reducers, 40% meat reducers, 13% pescatarians, 26% vegetarians, and 5% vegans.

An additional important factor to consider is the potential impact that participating in the research project could have on one’s dietary habits. The act of planning and committing to not consume or to consume less meat may increase the likelihood of such a change occurring (Carfora, Caso, and Conner 2017; Zur and Klöckner 2014). However, this is unlikely to be a substantial influencer, particularly when the nature of these campaigns is likely to include elements of dietary reflection through the act of changing one’s habits. In addition, some campaigns ask for specific goals (i.e. PTC and LEB) and all three vegan challenges included a final e-mail encouraging the continuation of a vegan lifestyle.

In any research project social desirability bias is an important consideration, whereby participants may engage in “satisficing” (Kaminska and Foulsham 2013) — attempts to provide the answers that they believe are viewed as socially desirable. Participants may feel that there is a desire for them to report lowered dietary rates and may therefore do so. Staff members may also feel the need to present their organizations in a positive light. All of these elements were considered during the analysis process and questions were designed to be simple, straightforward, and conversational in nature to minimize bias, in addition to creating a sense of comfort through engaging in casual conversation and maintaining an informal setting. The use of an on-line survey to collect dietary data and degree of motivators and barrier perceptions may also be one mechanism to reduce bias, as has been demonstrated by Gittelman et al. (2015). In addition, the inter-person nature of comparison has been designed to minimize the potential influence of such biases.

As this research project is the first comprehensive examination of the participants of meat reduction and vegan campaigns, the findings may be helpful in informing campaign design and delivery. In addition, where trends and variations are described, these can be used to identify questions for future research that may further support dietary change policies and campaigns. For any further information about the project, please refer to the full dissertation (to be released in 2019) or contact the researcher.
### 1. WHERE IS REDUCTION BEING PROMOTED?

**PARTICIPATING REDUCTION AND VEGAN CAMPAIGNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>LONGEVITY</th>
<th>SEVERITY</th>
<th>EMPHASIS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>On-line pledge</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>AFP Reduction</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Christians and specific church congregations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVC</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>On-line sign up</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Vegan</td>
<td>Animal Protection (mainly)</td>
<td>General, especially those already interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVUC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>On-line sign up</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Vegan</td>
<td>Animal Protection (mainly)</td>
<td>University students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Virtual Reality</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>Animal Protection</td>
<td>Mainly university students and those at relevant events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEB</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>On-line pledge</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>General, especially those already interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>On-line pledge</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>Environment (and some health)</td>
<td>Mainly those not interested in going veg*n, especially university students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>On-line sign up</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Vegan</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Current supporters and others who might be interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. WHO ARE REDUCERS AND ABSTAINERS?

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

In general, campaign samples suggest a lack of diversity in who they are reaching: 80% identified as female, 25% were from the top 10% of income, and 96% were white (compared to 82% of the general UK population). Three campaigns (IA, PTC, and GVUC) specifically targeted university students and thus had a larger proportion of those 18-24 years old.

Additional trends:

⇒ Vegan campaigns had a higher proportion of those under 35 (37%, $\bar{x}$=41) than reduction campaigns (25%, $\bar{x}$=48).
⇒ Reduction campaigns included a somewhat higher proportion of men (25% of participants) than vegan campaigns (9%).

DIETARY CHARACTERISTICS

Participants were extremely likely to report already reducing their AFP consumption over the previous six months and were unlikely to report plans to newly abstain from AFPS (e.g. pescatarians planning to become vegetarian).

Planned and reported changes tended to follow The Reduction Hierarchy, with participants most likely to plan to reduce red, then white, meat, before dairy, and finally fish and eggs. For abstention, fish generally preceded that of dairy or eggs.

Additional trends:

⇒ With the exception of vegans, on average vegetarians reported consuming the fewest servings of dairy and eggs.
⇒ Pescatarians generally consumed the most fish.
⇒ Meat reducers and non-reducers consumed similar amounts of AFPS, except that meat reducers tended to eat less red meat.
⇒ The main dietary shifts were vegetarians planning to become vegan, pescatarians planning to become vegetarian or vegan, and non-reducers planning to start reducing.

CURRENT AND PLANNED DIETS WITHIN SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT DIET</th>
<th>VEGAN</th>
<th>VEGETARIAN</th>
<th>PESCATARIAN</th>
<th>MEAT REDUCER*</th>
<th>NON-REDUCER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEGAN</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETARIAN</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESCATARIAN</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAT REDUCER*</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-REDUCER</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For current pescatarians and veg*ns, meat reducer refers to those who plan to start eating meat.
A CLOSER LOOK

I don’t think total vegetarianism is the right direction... I basically eat what I want, I just don’t want as much meat as I used to. I’d rather have locally-produced meat.

We’re not vegan yet

MANY REPORT CHANGE AS GRADUAL

MEAT REDUCERS MAY HAVE GOALS TO BE VEG*N

SOME REDUCERS MAY BE ANTI-VEG*N

MANY REPORTING A VEGETARIAN DIET STILL ATE FISH

DIETARY TRENDS BETWEEN CAMPAIGN SAMPLES

Clear differences emerged between the current and planned dietary habits of campaign participants, suggesting that they may be reaching different populations and serve distinct purposes in the transition process. While reduction campaigns included more meat reducers and non-reducers, vegan campaigns tended to draw more vegetarians and pescatarians.

Participants in two of three vegan campaigns generally did not plan to be following a vegan diet in six months, including 78% of those in the GVC and 70% of those in the GVUC. The 3DV instead drew more who were already vegan (21%, compared to 4% of GVC and 5% of GVUC participants) and fewer who did not plan to become vegan (31%).

Animal Aid’s Great Vegan Challenge (GVC):
⇒ Current: 4% vegan, 42% veg., 20% pesc., 27% meat reducer, 8% non-reducer
⇒ Planned: 22% vegan, 39% veg., 15% pesc., 23% meat red., <1% non-reducer

Animal Aid’s Great Vegan University Challenge (GVUC):
⇒ Current: 5% vegan, 35% veg., 20% pesc., 35% meat reducer, 5% non-reducer
⇒ Planned: 30% vegan, 35% vegetarian, 15% pescatarian, 20% meat reducer

Animal Equality’s iAnimal (IA):
⇒ Current: 38% vegan, 25% vegetarian, 19% meat reducer, 19% non-reducer
⇒ Planned: 44% vegan, 22% vegetarian, 25% pescatarian, 9% meat reducer

Friends of the Earth’s Let’s Eat Better Pledge (LEB):
⇒ Current: 4% vegan, 12% veg., 9% pesc., 52% meat reducer, 23% non-reducer
⇒ Planned: 5% vegan, 11% veg., 10% pesc., 61% meat red., 13% non-reducer

Part-Time Carnivore (PTC):
⇒ Current: 4% vegan, 13% veg., 7% pesc., 46% meat reducer, 30% non-reducer
⇒ Planned: 9% vegan, 9% veg., 9% pesc., 60% meat reducer, 13% non-reducer

Viva!’s 30 Day Vegan (3DV):
⇒ Current: 21% vegan, 33% veg., 4% pesc., 38% meat reducer, 4% non-reducer
⇒ Planned: 69% vegan, 8% veg., 2% pesc., 19% meat reducer, 2% non-reducer
3. HOW DID DIETARY CHANGE OCCUR?

Most participants (57%) were successfully meeting their reduction goals at six months, including 12% who had surpassed their initial goals (e.g. planned vegetarians eating a vegan diet). In addition, 71% reported eating fewer or zero servings of meat at six months than at zero.

REDUCTION AS GRADUAL AND FOCUSED ON RED MEAT

Reductions were generally (a) greatest in the first month, (b) gradual, and (c) tended to follow The Reduction Hierarchy. Participants were also most likely to plan to eat more fish or eggs, with more meat reducers planning to increase their fish consumption (32%) than those planning to eat less or none (25%). Few participants changed dietary category (e.g. pescatarian to vegetarian), with the most popular transitions being vegetarian to vegan.

STRicter GOALS MORE LIkely TO SUCCEED

Abstention goals were more likely to be met than plans to reduce. Of the dietary groups, planned meat reducers were the least likely to meet all of their dietary goals at each point (39% at six months). Those pursuing stricter goals were more likely to succeed, with planned vegans — the only group where the majority were not already following their planned diet — the most likely to be meeting their goals at each point and twice as likely to do so at six months (78%) than meat reducers.

MEAT REDUCERS WHO ATE LESS WHITE MEAT / FISH WERE MORE SUCCESSFUL

Meat reducers were more likely to eat less meat if they planned to reduce their white meat and/or fish consumption. Red meat reducers — those who planned to eat less red meat but not less white meat or fish — were as successful at reducing red meat but were more likely to eat more or the same in other areas. Where reductions occurred, they often disappeared but could instead lead to future abstentions, as can be seen in the Meat Reducer Typology. Over time, participants were more likely to report a veg*n diet and less likely to report eating meat.

THE MEAT REDUCER TYPOLOGY

Within planned meat reducers, three distinct groups emerged:

1. Temporary reducers (54% at six months) ate meat and did not decrease the amount from zero months.
2. Long-term reducers (36% at six months) ate no or less meat.
3. Abstainers (10% at six months) are following a pescatarian, vegetarian, or vegan diet.
REDUCTION GREATEST IN THE FIRST MONTH & OFTEN DISAPPEARED

Reductions were largest in the first month and, as demonstrated by the Meat Reducer Typology, where they did not lead to abstentions they often disappeared. In many areas, reducers were more likely to increase their consumption after the first month than to decrease it.

MORE ABSTAINERS, FEWER REDUCERS OVER TIME

Over time, an increasing proportion of participants reported a vegan, vegetarian, or pescatarian diet, while fewer reported eating meat. Those planning to follow a vegan diet increased from 14% at zero months to 17% at six months. In addition, after six months participants were more than two and a half times as likely to be reporting a vegan diet (5% at zero months and 13% at six months) and somewhat more likely to be vegetarian or pescatarian.

TRENDS WITHIN CAMPAIGNS

GREATER REDUCTIONS IN VEGAN CAMPAIGNS

Reductions were evident in each campaign population over time. However, due to the small sample sizes of many campaigns, analysis of dietary change within campaigns generally focuses on the two largest campaigns (the Great Vegan Challenge and the Let’s Eat Better Pledge).

Participants in vegan campaigns tended to reduce more and were more likely to shift dietary category (e.g. a pescatarian becoming a vegetarian). They were also more likely to exceed their dietary goals. In the two largest campaigns: 70% of GVC participants met their goal, 18% surpassed it, and 12% did not meet it, while 68% of LEB participants met their goal, 11% surpassed it, and 14% did not meet it.

Those in the 3DV were the most likely to be vegan (21% at zero months and 39% at six months) or vegetarian (34% and 31%, respectively) at any point in time, while being more than three times as likely as those in the GVC to plan to be vegan. PTC participants were the most likely to be consuming meat (77% at zero months and 67% at six months).
4. WHY?: REDUCTION MOTIVATORS

ANIMAL WELFARE, THE ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH: THE THREE PRIMARY MOTIVATORS

Participants generally had multiple motivating factors and were most likely to include animal protection (85% as a primary and 12% as secondary), followed by the environment (81% as primary and 15% as secondary) and health (61% as primary and 30% as secondary).

ANIMAL PROTECTION: A POWERFUL MOTIVATOR

Animal protection was an important, if not the most important, motivator in identifying reduction trends and successes. It was also the most universal motivating factor — a primary motivator for 85% of participants and secondary for 11%. It was the highest over-all motivator, including within every animal protection campaign and equal to the environment for the environmentally-based LEB. Environmental campaign participants were also more likely to be motivated by animals than those in animal protection campaigns were to be motivated by the environment. In addition, it was more strongly linked to larger reductions and higher levels of successful reduction and elimination than all other motivator categories.

This may be due to the nature of animal-related motivation. While other motivators (e.g. the environment or health) may rely on acquiring knowledge and be more readily abstracted from food sources, animal protection was often described as growing from particularly impactful experiences as a child or adult or a general feeling of care or concern for animals. The veg*n mindshift emerged, where AFPs could come to readily represent their animal origins, suffering, and death:

*Once I made that connection, I couldn’t unmake it.* — vegan VI1

*There’s no going back, ever. Once you’ve done it you just cannot, can you? Because I cannot even look at an egg or at milk now without thinking what it is.* — vegan LO3
However, such experiences and the potential of animal-based motivators are likely to depend on a variety of other factors, including: (a) knowledge of the treatment conditions of food animals, (b) a recognition of their capacity to suffer, (c) cognitive dissonance / “the meat paradox” (grappling with enjoying meat while not liking hurting animals) , and (d) one’s ethical stance on the treatment and slaughter of these animals.

HEALTH: AN ENGAGEMENT GAP FOR CAMPAIGNS

While previous research has generally found health to be as or almost as popular a motivating factor as animal protection, particularly amongst reducers, in this sample health was a much less prominent primary motivator (61%) than the environment (81%) or animal welfare (85%). This may present an engagement gap, as few reduction or vegan campaigns focus primarily on health motivators. Amongst this sample, health motivators were most prominent amongst the 3DV sample, where 85% reported that health was a primary motivator. This may be due to the food-focused element of this campaign.

THE ENVIRONMENT & HEALTH: EFFECTIVE AS SECONDARY MOTIVATORS

While the environment and health were both prominent motivators, they were most effective as secondary, rather than primary, motivators and particularly when animal protection was a primary motivator. Both were also inversely related to fish consumption, such that those most motivated by health and/or the environment were the least likely to reduce their fish intake. Environmental motivators, in particular, suffer from the “perfect moral storm” through high levels of abstraction, dispersion, and the fragmentation of agency. Health was also a prominent barrier (see section 5), though it had the potential to be an added “bonus” for transitioners:

I eat better than I ever did before. — vegan VI2

I feel healthier. — meat reducer BL3

FINDINGS BY MOTIVATOR

arranged from most to least popular

ANIMAL WELFARE:
- Strongest links to meeting goals & reduction amounts.
- Of motivators, had greatest difference between meat eaters and abstainers.
- May lead to vegan mindshift.
- Most popular for women and those over 34.

THE ENVIRONMENT:
- Most effective as secondary and when animal welfare a primary motivator.
- Relies on knowledge; consequences abstracted from food products.
- Related to eating more fish.
- Most popular for those with degrees.

HEALTH:
- Those motivated only by health were the least successful.
- More important that health wasn’t a barrier than that was a motivator.
- Related to eating more fish.
- More popular for 3DV participants, men, and older groups.

FOOD SAFETY:
- Primary motivator for 39%. Secondary for 33%.
- Relies on knowledge.
- Only linked to reductions for eggs (may be topical). Related to eating more fish.
- Most popular for 3DV, people of color (POC), and those with degrees.

FINANCIAL:
- Primary motivator for 16%. Secondary for 38%.
- Only category more popular amongst meat eaters than abstainers.
- Inversely related to reduction success.
- Many viewed as a barrier (see section 5).
- Most popular for POC, low income individuals, those in environmental campaigns, and people under 35.

RELIGION:
- Very uncommon. Primary for 7%. Secondary for 12%.
- Most popular for POC and low income individuals.
- Linked to reductions in all areas but fish.
5. WHY (NOT)?: REDUCTION BARRIERS

This sample represents a highly motivated and aware group and, yet, many participants were unable to meet their reduction goals. Awareness of motivating factors is not enough to promote widespread reductions and a variety of barriers can impede successful transitions. Barriers are discussed and analyzed in this section within components of the Behaviour Change Wheel (see p. 3).

On average, all areas were viewed as opportunities for change, rather than as barriers. Those pertaining to meat were generally viewed as less restrictive than those referring to eggs or dairy.

Barriers were generally lower for those who reduced more, particularly vegans, while highest for meat eaters. Barrier perception was also linked to reduction goals and successes. However, that some vegans and pescatarians viewed certain barriers as obtrusive – such as availability and taste – and yet still maintained their diet suggests that, for some, there may be a willingness or acceptance of making sacrifices in meeting reduction goals.

AUTOMATIC MOTIVATION: UNCONSCIOUS INFLUENCES

Identity emerged as an important barrier, particularly amongst meat eaters, with vegans generally viewed as a highly-stigmatized group, including associations with: (a) being fussy or awkward; (b) wealthy individuals; (c) hippies; (d) being extreme or radical (i.e. by following a diet that is too difficult or restrictive, or by being excessively healthy, or under-/ malnourished); and (e) femininity. Nonetheless, having a new identity could also be a positive, as a source of power and/or passion.

Perceptions of taste as a barrier were extremely varied, with some meat eaters stating they did not particularly like or desire the taste of meat, while some vegans described having “loved meat” (vegan BL5) or experiencing cravings (particularly for dairy cheese) years after transitioning. Interestingly, some vegans described giving into their cravings as a final motivating factor to fully commit to a vegan lifestyle, finding that “it didn’t taste as good as I imagined” (vegan MA3). Taste was, for some, a motivator, particularly for those who described a visceral revulsion to meat.

Some described abstention as a potential sacrifice or described a willingness to make sacrifices: “If I couldn’t find anything to eat, I’d eat toast or something.” — vegan LO3. Many vegans also described consuming new foods and expanding their palates: “Taste has gone up for me. I’m surprised at how much I do enjoy my food.” — vegan VI3.

Using AFP substitutes could help some through the transition process by enabling the maintenance of familiar habits and meal constructs. However, some struggled with strong emotional attachments and associations to certain foods (e.g. vegan BL6 described craving a particular type of non-vegan chocolate whenever she was unwell). Emotions, in particular, are likely an important but under-researched component of the transition process.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPABILITIES: ACCESS TO ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE AND COGNITIVE PROCESSES

This area had the largest gains during the research period of any barrier category. However, meat reducers were more likely to increase their skills at finding veg*n recipes, while abstainers were more likely to report developing increased plant-based cooking skills. Vegans were also significantly more likely than other groups to report having the ability to cook vegan meals (94% of vegans, compared to 66% of vegetarians, 60% of pescatarians, and 55% of both meat reducers and non-reducers). The maintenance of omnivorously normative dietary habits may make veg*n eating seem more time-intensive and inhibit the development of new, unconscious dietary norms and habits.
In particular, participants could struggle when maintaining familiar notions of a "proper meal," such as the common British construct of "meat and two veg." When maintaining old habits, reducers may be less likely to obtain requisite skills and knowledge, while preparing and consuming veg*n meals requires conscious reflection. Ultimately, where significant changes occurred to patterns of behavior, these often seemed to reflect not simply a change in the quantities of AFPs consumed but in the formation of "a whole new way of eating" — vegan MA5.

Knowledge and skills were commonly described as initially important, but easily acquired over time, with some of the largest barrier decreases occurring in this area. Abstainers and those participating in vegan campaigns tended to report greater increases in their psychological capabilities. Campaigns were also described as an important source of information, particularly by providing recipes, information about where to find veg*n foods, and health information (e.g. plant-based protein sources).

Conceptions of the necessity of consuming AFPs varied significantly between continuing consumers (i.e. meat reducers and non-reducers) and abstainers, with meat eaters likely to view these foods as essential dietary components. For instance, while 94% of vegans, 95% of vegetarians, and 89% of pescatarians didn’t agree that meat was a necessary protein source, only 46% of meat reducers and 34% of non-reducers indicated the same.

Health misinformation was commonly described as pervasive and a key barrier, with vegan VI3 explaining how she continued eating meat for several years, thinking "we needed a certain amount of meat."

PHYSICAL OPPORTUNITIES: AVAILABILITY AND ACCESS TO ESSENTIAL RESOURCES

The belief that a veg*n diet was more expensive was, on average, the largest reported barrier, though wide variation emerged within the survey sample and focus groups. Perceptions of cost can relate to governmental policies and subsidies that contribute to disproportionately low AFP prices. Participants lacking in the time, skills, or motivation to cook could also rely more heavily on pre-made or highly processed veg*n alternatives that may have been more expensive. For these individuals, availability could also be perceived as a greater barrier, though dramatic increases in the availability of veg*n alternatives and ready meals may make this less of an issue over time.

The development of veg*n habits and cooking skills could help reduce perceptions that a veg*n diet is more expensive or (too) difficult. Those practicing veg*nism (i.e. abstainers) were less likely to view veg*n diets as more expensive after six months, while meat reducers were more likely to do so. Other factors could inhibit physical opportunities, including travelling, having kids, living in a rural environment, or having non-veg*n friends and family.
Though external, perceived physical opportunities are likely to be closely linked to an individual’s habits and psychological capabilities (particularly whether or not one cooks), as well as social opportunities, when needing to attend non-veg*n events or prepare food for non-veg*n family members.

**SOCIAL OPPORTUNITIES: COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND SOCIAL ISOLATION**

Barriers related to the social and cultural environment emerged as particularly impactful, especially for vegan transitioners. The potential for feelings of isolation and social distancing from omnivorous and non-veg*n friends could arise through conflict over one’s new lifestyle choices, a discomfort with the continued dietary practices of non-veg*ns, or the appeal of joining or forming veg*n communities with those who may have similar ideals and experiences.

Having access to other veg*ns and, in particular, communities where veg*nism was normalized, could provide essential support and access to resources for new transitioners. Access to communities and other reducers could help to overcome stigmas, provide opportunities to acquire essential skills and information, and create supportive settings around common norms and ethics. However, social distancing from omnivorous norms and individuals, in conjunction with the formation or growth of veg*n communities, could further contribute to difficulties encountering omnivorous behavior.

Non-veg*n friends and family were often described, particularly by vegans, as sources of conflict, especially when inundating new reducers with questions about health and ethical elements of consumption. Vegans, in particular, may feel they have to “perform” veganism to minimize discomfort, highlight the positives of their dietary choices, and curtail potential conflict.²¹

Social encounters could create tricky situations, where reducers may not want to “make a fuss” (vegan LO7) and want to avoid negative reactions or encounters. Many near-vegans maintained exceptions to their veganism in such social situations, such as at work or social functions or when dining out. This phenomena could also be linked to cultural notions of eating as both pleasurable and social, whereby abstainers may not want to feel deprived.

You’re constantly having to fight your battles and you’re having to defend what you’re eating. That was exhausting. ... That was almost like a – do I really wanna do this anymore? And I had to keep continuously reminding myself of why I was doing it because ... I felt a lot of pressure to educate myself on having the right answers when people asked me questions. ... It’s just very stressful. You don’t wanna have to have a deep, quite heated argument every time you have a meal and I think that would be something that would push people to not do it so much anymore ... if you have to defend your food choices all the time. - vegan BN6

Being around those who are also following a similar diet may not be essential for a sustained veg*n transition. One additional source of support could come from “non-practicing practitioners.”²² By consuming or preparing shared foods and potentially adopting some veg*n habits in their own lifestyles, sympathetic friends and family members could reinforce the normalization of vegan dietary practices and support transitioners in feeling less isolated.

Despite the central role social elements were described as playing in the transition process, there were few social opportunities provided by campaigns. Notable exceptions included GVC’s Facebook group and an in-person participant event, as well as the PTC’s opportunity to join teams (e.g. local or university-based).
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings within this report support the ability to identity key trends in the transition process within individual variability. Specific trends include: (a) a lack of diversity within the sample; (b) the importance of social barriers — especially for vegan transitioners; (c) the potential power of animal motives and potential for a vegan mindshift; (d) the need for diversified campaigns to address individual variety; and (e) the potential importance of changing not simply what one eats but how one eats, transitioning reflective behaviors into reflexive habits.

A LACK OF DIVERSITY WITHIN CAMPAIGN POPULATIONS

A lack of sociodemographic diversity within the sample suggests that campaigns are reaching overlapping populations that include a disproportionate percentage of female, white, high income, and university-educated individuals. In particular, the lack of male participants in surveys (20% of participants) and focus groups (6%) is likely to reflect a lower proportion of men within reduction campaign populations. Participants were also extremely likely to report already reducing and being aware of the benefits of meat reduction for the environment (89%) and animal welfare (85%) and egg and dairy reduction for animal welfare (71%).

Researchers have found that individuals from minority groups may feel ostracized from campaigns due to the perpetuation of normative conceptions of veg*nism and veg*n individuals, as well as messaging that ignores human oppression or uses it as a campaigning tool. For instance, in her evaluation of the Meatless Mondays campaign, Singer found that it promoted stereotypical gender roles while attempting to address men’s potential “crisis of masculinity” that may be triggered through discussions of meat reduction. Associating reduction / abstention with such campaigns and messaging may contribute to feelings that reduction is only for privileged individuals or that certain communities would not be welcome within the movement.

How can campaigns reach more diverse populations?

One possible strategy, particularly to reach more men and non-reducers, could be to have campaigns that focus more on “pro-self” (e.g. health or cost savings) motivators in recruiting participants. That almost every member of this sample reported being largely motivated by altruistic or “pro-social” (e.g. animal welfare or the environment) motives is unlikely to reflect the general reducer population and, potentially, many who are motivated by health, price, or taste. Findings that the environment was almost as significant a motivator as animal welfare and higher than health is in contradistinction to previous research with more general populations where health has typically been identified as a more common motivating factor. However, additional research on the impact of pro-self vs. pro-social motivators is essential, as pro-self motivators were less strongly linked to reduction rates and successes, with financial motives being related to less reduction.

A second possible strategy could include addressing veg*n stigmas by highlighting veg*ns of color, male veg*ns, and ways to follow a veg*n lifestyle that are easy and inexpensive. For instance, a 2018 documentary highlighted the lack of visibility of vegans of color in the United States and the common view that veganism is “a white thing.” Associating veg*n diets with an expensive lifestyle for the wealthy (e.g. açai and quinoa — vegan BN6) may make reduction seem inaccessible for low income individuals, particularly when combined with policies that have enabled the mass production of cheap AFPs. This is exacerbated by meat prices being deliberately kept low in ways that are invisible to the general population, such that “[w]hat the consumer sees is cheap and abundant meat.”

Finally, campaigns could work through a lens that addresses human oppression, by collaborating with those working to address human oppression, centring those from marginalized communities in campaigns and the campaign design process, and by promoting or working in an intersectional capacity (i.e. to address multiple forms of oppression). Organizations currently working to address both human and animal oppression include: Afro-Vegan Society, Better Health Better Life, Collectively Free, Black Vegans Rock, Food Empowerment Project, LifeAfterHummus, A Well-Fed World, Black VegFest, Encompass, Earthling Liberation Collective, Sistah Vegan, and Vegan Rainbow Project.

This research project is the first to look at a large sample of participants from different reduction and vegan campaigns and, as such, the lack of diversity identified is an important finding for those within the movement and researchers seeking to understand strategies for reduction promotion. It would be extremely valuable for future research to identify further strategies to make reduction and veg*n campaigns and communities more welcoming and inclusive to those from minority sociodemographic backgrounds.
SOCIAL ELEMENTS: KEY BUT GENERALLY UNADDRESSSED

Reduction campaigns face the challenging task of changing behavior at an individual level when daily dietary decisions are inherently tied to broader social and cultural trends. A lack of social support in conjunction with negative reactions from friends and family was commonly cited as a cause of distress and a key barrier in maintaining reduction goals, particularly for abstainers.

While some barriers within the Behaviour Change Wheel framework can be addressed through joint strategies, interventions to raise social opportunities are almost entirely distinct from those addressing psychological capabilities (knowledge and skills) or reflective motivation (motivation). Potential intervention functions increasing social opportunities could work to normalize veg*n consumption, while minimizing reducer discomfort. These could include:

- **Restructuring the environment**: increase social supports and cultural norms for reduction / abstention.
- **Restriction**: not offering (or limiting options of) meat / AFPs in social environments (e.g. at work functions, through public procurement, or in restaurants).
- **Enablement**: provide cues and prompts for reduction / abstention.

Example interventions could include:

- Ensuring restaurants and stores clearly label vegetarian and vegan options.
- Changing nutrition guidelines.
- Public information campaigns promoting culturally-relevant veg*n options (e.g. a vegan roast in the UK).
- Putting veg*n options at the top of restaurant menus.
- Requiring that all public spaces (e.g. hospitals and public schools) provide vegan options.
- Providing spaces where veganism is normalized, such as hosting pot lucks, on-line groups, or providing vegan mentors.

THE VEGAN MINDSHIFT AND THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF ANIMAL-RELATED MOTIVATION

Within this sample, being motivated by animal protection was linked to the greatest reduction levels and likelihood of meeting one’s reduction goals. By re-thinking and consciously consuming, veg*ns may be more likely to connect meat or other AFPs with their animal origins, re-centring the animal source within food products previously unconsciously consumed.

Newfound awareness, coupled with a commitment to completely abstain from the consumption of meat or AFPs, can serve as tools for constructing animal-derived foods as inedible or embodied representations of suffering and death. The act and decision to consume becomes a reflection on one’s ethical values: “Why would I want to change my beliefs for a piece of cake?” (vegan VI2). Many vegan participants, in particular, expressed having reached a new view or understanding of AFPs from which there was no return, a **mindshift**:

*[Being vegan] was quite hard at the beginning, but because I had the ethics were what was behind my decision, I couldn’t see myself going back, so I was like, ‘I’m just gonna have to make the most [of this.]’ — vegan BN6*

A total shift in perspective, as with the adoption of a new dietary identity, may most commonly develop gradually and is unlikely to be achieved through a single exposure or experience. Social and cultural norms, a lack of physical and social opportunities, and the need to acquire a variety of psychological capabilities can impede even those highly motivated and aware from changing their dietary habits. Meat reducer MA2 demonstrated the potential to feel that one’s dietary behavior is unethical, even while continuing to engage in it, stating:

*[Animals] still feel pain. I mean, to me, they feel pain and they feel fear, and to me that is the thing that makes them no different at all. And if you wouldn’t do it to a child or you wouldn’t do it to a dog or cat, why should you do it to any other animal? You know, to me that’s the bottom line and I don’t know how anybody can step over that line. Says the person who does eat meat occasionally.*

The inherent contradiction in this sentiment – that a behavior crosses an ethical “line” that one, nonetheless, continues to engage in – hints at the complex psychological components and social and cultural norms underlying the consumption of animal flesh and secretions.
Ultimately, “meat consumption is not simply a gustatory behaviour, but also an ideological one.”

When a shift in perspective has not been fully internalized, as with MA2, reducers may slip back into previous, omnivorous habits. A high degree of motivation – especially motivation to help animals – may enable reducers to overcome and accept reduction barriers, while the acceptance of veg*n dietary norms may help form and maintain new ways of eating that reject previously-held omnivorous norms.

Initial considerations of animal suffering were most commonly described for mammalian companion or farm animals (i.e. dogs, cats, pigs, goats, or cows). Once reducers begin to connect meat consumption with living animals through a recognition of the “meat paradox,” they may be open to and begin to seek out information about the external impacts of other types of AFPs. Vegan participants generally described having overcome the disconnect associated with the meat paradox.

For those who have achieved a vegan mindshift, consuming AFPs may no longer be seen as an option, as with LO7: “When you’re out with other people, … you can be put in a situation where you don’t really have very many options and you just have to go hungry.” Barriers can be irrelevant (or less important) for such consumers who plan to maintain their diets no matter what. Such perspective shifts represent the potential power this motivator may have in achieving sustainable reductions. Further research into how to promote a mindshift that re-centres the animal source within animal food products may be particularly helpful for campaigners and policy makers.

**DIVERSIFIED CAMPAIGNS ARE NECESSARY TO ADDRESS AN INDIVIDUALIZED PROCESS**

The decision to reduce and the reduction process can vary widely between individuals. For some, it may be “all about the animals” — vegan VI1, “global environmental issues” — pescatarian BL4, or a desire to be healthier — meat reducer LO1. While a commitment to animal protection was linked to the greatest levels of reduction and reduction successes for most of the sample population, varied social and physical contexts can have a significant impact on barrier perceptions, motivating factors, and the nature of one’s dietary transition.

By better understanding the motivations and needs of their participants, campaigns may be able to maximize effectiveness. Within this sample participants described signing up to campaigns for a variety of significant and non-significant reasons, including:

- **Campaigns could be something fun to try out** or a challenge, with one then-vegetarian, now-vegan signing up to the GVC “as a bit of a whim. … I was just bored and thought, ‘No, I can do this.’” — LO3
- **One participant described signing up as a way to influence others:** “I can share [the 3DV] on social media and I’m like, ‘Guys, look at this! Everybody join in!’ … Last year five people did it with me.” — vegan BL6
- **Some could not recall which campaign they had participated in,** suggesting this may have not been a significant factor in their transition.
- **Campaigns could be used as a tool or a step toward a particular goal** for those who may want to change their habits but perhaps “don’t know where to even begin.” — meat reducer LO1
- **Participants may turn to campaigns as sources of essential information** to assist in their transition. For example, the 3DV provides four recipes a day during the vegan challenge month.
- **Campaigns may be the initial motivation** for dietary change by instigating a new perspective or desire to change one’s lifestyle. For example, iAnimal may provide opportunities for an initial exposure to the treatment of animals raised for food in modern intensive systems.

The use of varied, targeted strategies may help reach a greater proportion of the population and provide information most relevant to individuals’ lifestyles, values, and attitudes. However, the wide variations in reduction journeys and dietary characteristics between individuals suggests that a generalized reduction campaign without a specific target audience is unlikely to be the most effective approach.

Goals are a key component of any behavior change model and while meat reduction can present a dietary goal, this may need to be clarified, as meat reducers were more likely to consume the same or more meat than to consume less or none after six months. For those who may not currently be interested in campaigns that include a veg*n goal, a clear meat reduction goal or stepped approach, with increasing goals leading to a fully vegan diet may be most effective. This may also increase the potential for participants to later pursue a veg*n goal.
FROM REFLECTIVE REDUCTION TO REFLEXIVE VEG*NISM: A NEW WAY OF EATING

Through participating in a campaign, individuals may not only change their consumption of AFPs but their perspective on consumption itself. While a mindshift may most readily facilitate this process through the re-categorization as non-foods, practicing new styles of eating may support the formation of unconscious habits and, ultimately, a new understanding of the eating process.

For participants who are lacking in motivation or are heavily reliant on culturally normative omnivorous practices, the first step in their transition may be a recognition that a meat-free or vegan meal can be sufficient, healthy, and tasty. Here, the use of veg*n substitutes can be helpful in maintaining meal-time norms and make the transition process feel less dramatic.

However, the continued reliance on pre-formed, omnivorous habits and norms may inhibit the transition from reflective to reflexive consumption. Each time reducers plan and consume a veg*n meal they may then rely on conscious reflection and thus view these occurrences as time-intensive, complicated, and/or expensive. While meat-centric meals may remain easy and habitual, veg*n meals may require a recipe or the purchasing of pre-made meals or substitutes.

To establish a new behavior, one ultimately needs to practice it. It may be that, for those psychologically and physically able and ready, the participation in a month-long vegan challenge can better support the establishment and maintenance of new ways of eating and new dietary norms. By necessitating vegan habit formation through repeated and regular practicing of veganism, participants may not only be more likely to find veganism to be easy, they may have more opportunities to explore new foods and types of meals.

Abstainers commonly described having an expanded palette and developing skills to integrate reflexive vegan habits into their daily lifestyle. Near-vegan BL5 explained: "I’ve become really organized and I cook twice a week in batches so I sometimes freeze stuff and I’m set for the week.”

The reducer may struggle between that which is highly routinized and, therefore, less reliant on time and energy and that which is highly rational and dependent upon conscious effort and planning. The (however partial) maintenance of familiar dietary habits and norms may make it easy to fall back on old habits when pressed for time, as with meat reducer BL1: “Sometimes if I’m ever in a hurry I’ll buy a packet of cheap supermarket meat.”

Veg*n diets may be more readily adopted when consumers embrace and formulate new conceptions of food and the necessary components of a proper meal. Veg*n and pescatarian diets can be reimagined as not simply the absence of “proper” foods (e.g. “proper cheese” – MA5 and MA3) to be substituted with lesser-than foods that are commonly seen as less valuable, less tasty, or less substantial. Rather than viewing these diets as “limiting yourself,” seeing them as “opening yourself to a whole new way of eating” (vegan MA5) may minimize feelings of sacrifice and promote positive dietary experiences. Those holding onto omnivorous dietary norms may continue to perceive meals as necessitating meat (or a meat-like element), the so-called “meat of the dish.” Instead, where new routines are formed, they can legitimize and provide relief from dietary reflexivity. Ultimately, the reflexive reducer may be more likely than the reflective reducer to achieve lasting sustainable reductions.

Potential strategies for promoting vegan dietary norms:

⇒ Learn more about participants’ habits to provide tailored information. For instance, if participants do not cook, it may be helpful to focus on providing easy recipes and information about where to find ready-made meals. For those with limited resources (e.g. time for those with kids or finances for those with a low budget), inexpensive and easy recipes that the whole family can enjoy may be best.

Other considerations: location (rural/urban), dietary habits of friends and family, or willingness to try new foods.

⇒ Address beliefs about a “proper meal” and encourage new types of meals that do not require a central meat-type element. By directly discussing cultural dietary norms in campaigns, participants may be able to become aware of their pre-formed assumptions. For instance, in the UK highlighting the idea of “meat and two veg” and showing examples of other types of meals (e.g. a curry or a stir-fry).

⇒ Ideas of the adequacy of a meal are likely to be linked to conceptions about protein and other nutrients. Providing information about how easy it is to get enough protein may help overcome concerns that veg*n meals are inadequate or require careful preparation to have sufficient nutrients.

⇒ By hosting month-long abstention challenges, participants will be compelled to practice veg*nism and be more likely to adopt veg*n norms and habits.
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