

What Works to Reduce Animal Product Consumption?

An evidence table from a meta-review of 18 reviews. For more information please see full report:

<https://osf.io/preprints/mcdsq/>

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
<p>Providing information</p>	<p>Providing information about the environmental consequences of eating meat</p>	<p>Three reviews^{1 2 3} cited 11 unique studies. A statistically significant majority of results were in favour of the intervention (10/11; 91%; 95% CI [62.3%, 98.4%]; $p = .012$).</p>
	<p>Providing information about the health consequences of eating meat</p>	<p>Five reviews^{1 2 4 5 6} cited 10 unique studies. Majority of results were in favour of the intervention (8/10; 80%; 95% CI [49%, 94.3%]; $p = .11$).</p>
	<p>Providing information about the animal welfare consequences of eating meat</p>	<p>Two reviews^{1 2} cited 2 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (2/2; 91%; 95% CI [34.2%, 100%]; $p = .5$).</p>
	<p>Providing information about multiple reasons to reduce animal-product consumption (e.g., health and environmental arguments)</p>	<p>Five reviews^{1 2 4 7 8} cited 16 unique studies. Results were mixed, with over half being in favour of the intervention (11/16; 68.75%; 95% CI [44.4%, 85.8%]; $p = .21$).</p>

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Implicitly emphasising animal welfare	Reminding consumers of the animal origins of meat through displaying meat with the head attached	Three reviews ^{1 5 10} cited 3 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (3/3; 100%; 95% CI [43.9%, 100%]; p = .25).
	Showing cute/live animals in meat advertisements or next to meat recipes	Two reviews ^{1 5} cited 3 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (3/3; 100%; 95% CI [43.9%, 100%]; p = .25).
	Reminding consumers of the animal origins of meat through images of cows heading to slaughter	Three reviews ^{1 2 5} cited 1 unique study. Results were in favour of the intervention (1/1; 100%; 95% CI [20.7%, 100%]; p = 1).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Goal-setting and self-monitoring	Text message reminders to monitor red or processed meat consumption	Six reviews ^{1 2 4 5 7 8} cited 2 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (2/2; 100%; 95% CI [34.2%, 100%]; p = .5).
	Creating implementation intentions (e.g., intentions to consume meat-free meals in specific circumstances, imagining barriers and solutions)	Five reviews ^{1 2 4 7 8} cited 2 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (2/2; 100%; 95% CI [34.2%, 100%]; p = .5).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Social consequences of eating meat	Norms (Emphasising how the amount of people following plant-based diets is growing/ Conveying positive representations of plant-based diets through popular TV shows)	Five reviews ^{1 5 7 8 9} cited 4 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (4/4; 100%; 95% CI [51%, 100%]; $p = .125$).
	Telling people about negative social consequences of eating meat (e.g., popularity, poorer social image)	Three reviews ^{1 2 11} cited 1 unique study. Results were in favour of the intervention (1/1; 100%; 95% CI [20.7%, 100%]; $p = 1$).
	Telling people who reject social dominance that those who are more socially dominant eat more meat	Two reviews ^{1 2} cited 1 unique study. Results were not in favour of the intervention (0/1; 100%; 95% CI [0%, 79.3%]; $p = 1$).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Default plant-based meals	Offer plant-based meals and menus as the default option at restaurants	Five reviews ^{1 3 4 8 12} cited 1 unique study. Results were in favour of the intervention (1/1; 100%; 95% CI [20.7%, 100%]; $p = 1$).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Providing meat alternatives	Providing people with meat alternatives to try (e.g., mycoprotein products)	One review ¹⁰ cited 3 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (3/3; 100%; 95% CI [43.9%, 100%]; $p = .25$).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Description of meat / meat alternatives	Labelling meat options as "meat" instead of "standard" or "normal" in cafeterias Referring to "beef" and "pork" dishes as "cow" and "pig"	Two reviews ^{1 10} cited 2 unique studies. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (2/2; 100%; 95% CI [34.2%, 100%]; p = .5).
	Changing name of meat-free meals to more appealing alternatives Highlighting a plant-based meal as the "Chef's recommendation"	One review ¹⁰ cited 3 unique studies. Majority of results were not in favour of the intervention (1/3; 100%; 95% CI [6.1%, 79.2%]; p = 1).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Economic interventions	Providing financial incentives for healthy food/drink purchases Changing prices of different meat serving portions from decreasing price per unit with increasing portion size to stable price per unit across portion sizes	Two reviews ^{7 10} cited two unique studies. Results were consistently not in favour of the intervention (0/2; 100%; 95% CI [0%, 65.8%]; $p = .5$).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Personalised messaging	Tailoring messaging based on the receivers state of change, animal-product intake levels, or personality	Two reviews ^{1 2} cited 10 unique studies. Results were mixed, with just over half of studies being in favour of the intervention (6/11; 60%; 95% CI [31.3%, 83.2%]; p = .75).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Individual lifestyle counselling		One review ² cited 8 unique studies. Majority of results were in favour of the intervention (6/8; 75%; 95% CI [40.9%, 92.9%]; p = .29).

Intervention	Sub-category (if applicable)	Review findings
Reducing meat portion sizes	Supermarkets offering the option of smaller meat portion sizes Restaurants reducing meat portion sizes but maintaining dish volume by increasing vegetable servings	Three reviews ^{4 7 10} cited 4 unique studies conducted in lab and field (restaurant, stores) settings. Results were consistently in favour of the intervention (4/4; 100%; 95% CI [51%, 100%]; $p = .125$).

References

¹Harguess and colleagues (2020), ²Bianchi and colleagues (2018), ³Hartmann and Siegrist (2017), ⁴ Veul (2018), ⁵Graça and colleagues (2019), ⁶Valli and colleagues (2019), ⁷Taufik and colleagues (2019), ⁸Wynes and colleagues (2018), ⁹Nisa and colleagues (2019), ¹⁰Bianchi and colleagues (2018b), ¹¹Sanchez-Sabate and Sabaté (2019) , ¹²Byerly and colleagues (2018).

Full citations are available in the preprint: <https://osf.io/preprints/mcdsq/>