

# Pathways to Veganism: Exploring Effective Messages in Vegan Transition

Report on additional focus group phase of project – November 2019

Professor Claire Parkinson  
Dr Richard Twine  
Dr Claire Blennerhassett  
Lara Herring

Centre for Human Animal Studies (CfHAS), Edge Hill University, UK.



Edge Hill University



## Focus groups

### Method

This part of the project investigated non-vegan responses to pro-vegan messages centred around ethical and emotional response to human/animal relations that might be encountered in daily life and particularly via social media. The research team conducted six focus groups over November 2019. Each focus group lasted around sixty minutes. The sessions were audio recorded and focus group respondents were given vouchers as an incentive to participate. Recruitment for the focus groups was conducted through internal university communication channels, social media and via a convenience sampling method. Eligibility criteria for inclusion in the focus groups were female, non-vegans aged between 25-45. The focus groups were used to explore further some observations from the questionnaire data.

Following the findings of Guest et al (2017) on the number and sizes of focus groups necessary for an evidence base, six focus groups were convened with participant numbers limited to a minimum of six and a maximum of eight per group. Guest et al found that 80% of all themes on a topic were discoverable within two to three focus groups and that the most prevalent themes were identifiable with three focus groups with a mean of 7.75 individuals per group. As the eligibility criteria (female, non-vegans aged between 25-45) allowed high levels of demographic heterogeneity, six focus groups were convened (see Fig. 1). Each focus group employed scripted questions, rating and picture sorting as elicitation techniques to reach saturation (the point at which new information produced little or no change to the coding). The demographic heterogeneity of participants overall did not affect the anticipated saturation which was reached after four focus groups.

Fig. 1:

Group	Number	Age group
1	8	25-45
2	8	25-45
3	7	25-45
4	7	25-45
5	8	25-45
6	6	25-45

Before the sessions began, the research team ensured that participants were fully informed about the project and each participant signed a consent form. To begin the focus group session, there was a brief introduction to the project and to those involved. The participants were then shown three videos taken from social media, advocacy campaign materials, and from a national advertising campaign. The first video, posted on YouTube via Brut, featured actor Joaquin Phoenix talking about his experiences of

being a vegan. The second advert, a nationwide advertisement campaign by Tesco supermarket, depicted a family choosing a vegan alternative to modify a home recipe following a child's decision to stop eating animals. The third and final video, posted on the One Green Planet website, showed the story of a crying cow rescued from the slaughterhouse and adopted by a sanctuary. Following each video, the focus group moderator asked the participants what they thought of the video and how it made them feel. Following their responses to the third video, the moderator asked participants to rank the videos according to which had the greatest emotional connection for the group. Participants were asked to reach a consensus as to the ranking (see Fig. 2). Once a consensus had been agreed, the moderator asked the participants whether they would share any of the videos on social media, and if so, which and why? (See Fig. 3)

In the second part of the focus group, each participant was presented with a series of images containing farmed animals (see appendices A-E). The media presented to participants were in the form of five A4 print outs. The sources for each image and the precise context were not made available to the participants. The moderator asked the participants to each take a few moments to individually look at the images. When the moderator judged that the group had had adequate time to look at the examples, the participants were asked to discuss, as a group, how each image made them feel. Once the participants had discussed each of the five images, the moderator asked the group to rank the images according to their emotional strength from 1 -5 where 1 is the most emotionally compelling. As with the videos, participants were asked to reach a consensus on this ranking (see Fig. 4).

Fig. 2:

FG	Video Ranking	Notes
1	2 [Tesco], 3 [cow], 1 [JP]	Tesco agreed first, because of its positive message and that it was something everyone could "connect to" (familiarity, <i>human</i> relationship). Most participants agreed that they didn't feel anything for the other two videos, but the cow one had an emotional connection initially. Everyone agreed no emotional connection at all with JP.
2	3 [cow], 2 [Tesco], 1 [JP]	Early consensus that video one was last. There was some debate as to two and three, agreeing that three had more emotional "range" but two was their favourite.
3	1 [JP], 3 [cow], 2 [Tesco]	A lot of debate. Earliest consensus that 2 was last. Finally agreed that 1 was the first because of its broader impact and the informative content. Also they were dubious that the cow was actually crying.

4	1 [JP], 3 [cow], 2 [Tesco]	Early consensus that video 3 was last but then agreed that video 2 was least emotional because they resented it for making them feel guilty. General agreement that video 1 had the most emotional connection because it was educational and had a broad range.
5	3 [cow], 1 [JP], 2 [Tesco]	A lot of debate and had to be worked out by a slight majority.
6	3 [cow], 2 [Tesco], 1 [JP]	A sense that if you had kids, you would choose video 2 as most emotional connection, if you didn't you would choose video 3. There was a lot of debate and again it had to be agreed by a majority.

Fig. 3:

FG	Share on social media?	Why?
1	No. Probably not. Maybe the Tesco advert.	Don't really share videos. Too provocative. Don't like it when others post similar. Not something I'm interested in/passionate about. Don't post "political" videos.
2	Most said no. One said they <i>had</i> shared the Tesco one. One said they might share the Tesco one.	Don't really share videos. Don't like pushing an agenda. It would be hypocritical. Not what I "stand for." Don't have an influential position. One participant did share video 2 because they "really liked it," not for the message. Another said they would share it for the recipe - not the message.
3	All but one said no. One said they would share JP vid.	One would share video 1 "to educate people" and show that "celebrities do it". One said they might include the Tesco recipe in their cooking blog but only for the recipe. Reasons for not sharing included not wanting to "preach", and not wanting to appear to be trying to change anyone's mind.
4	Definitive, unanimous no.	Because they are "not saying anything new."
5	Definitive, unanimous no.	Agreed they would not, because as non-vegans it would feel hypocritical.

6	Overall, no. Possibly video one.	Don't post "political" videos. Don't like sharing "opinionated" things online for fear of backlash and/or upsetting people. One person said they might share vid 1 as "passing information" just to show that veganism is "possible."
---	----------------------------------	---

Fig. 4:

FG	Image Ranking	Why?
1	5, 2, 1, 3, 4	Pig definitely most emotive. JP definitely least emotive. Two, one and three were all close in terms of emotive.
2	2, 3, 5, 1, 4	"It's the baby thing. It's powerful"
3	5, 1, 2, 3, 4	Early agreement that 4 is the least and 5 the most emotive.
4	5, 3, 2, 1, 4	Early consensus that 4 was least and chickens next least. Noted that they couldn't decide between the ones with babies in them.
5	2, 5, 3, 1, 4	Early agreement that 4 is the least. Then a lot of debate with a definite agreement that they were emotionally drawn to the parent-child dynamic.
6	5, 3, 2, 1, 4	Early agreement that 4 is the least. Then a lot of debate before agreeing that 1 would be second to last and 5 would be first. Then decided amongst the last two.

## Choice of animals

In constructing a pro-vegan advert an important decision is whether to include images of nonhuman animals. Our sample of videos and images included a range of animals and some where humans were centred. This afforded the opportunity to gauge degrees of identification with specific animal species, and how cultural constructions of animals were conveyed in the focus group setting. Different ages of animals were also included in order to better understand how degree of identification may change not only by species but whether younger animals garnered enhanced emotional response.

The first video was centred around a celebrity but did include some animals. Joaquin Phoenix is shown briefly petting a sheep and as part of a parade of activists, each holding a dead animal. However, these moments are not the central focus of the video. The second video similarly does not visually centre animals. As an advert for Tesco it focuses on human familial relations with a young daughter announcing to her father, she no longer wishes to eat animals. The third video, in contrast, is focused on an animal, a cow named Emma who gains some freedom in being rescued by a sanctuary.

All five images shown are of animals. Image one was of a crowded broiler chicken enclosure. Image two showed a newly born calf separated from the mother. Image three showed lambs separated from their parents, trying to get back to them by scaling a wall. Image four showed Joaquin Phoenix with a chicken superimposed over his right eye. It was accompanied by a slogan: we are all animals. The final image showed an adult pig in a gestation crate with piglets beside her able to feed but also separated via the metal crate.

A consistent finding across FGs was that, although there was concern expressed over the factory farming context, images 1 and 4 elicited the least degree of identification. Several participants across more than one group expressed negative emotions toward birds. It could be that a video/image sample of chicks would have worked differently.

“I’ve got no emotion with the birds. I hate birds. If it was a different animal...”  
(FG2 44:19)

“They don’t have the same kind of- when you see a sheep you can kind of think of it as a dog but when you’ve got a chicken you don’t really” (FG2 44:25)

“It just freaked me out because I’m terrified of birds. If we go to the farm, I avoid the chickens. If I take the kids to the farm, I just avoid the birds” (FG4 42:24)

“I feel that because I do rank chickens lower” (FG6 38:01)

The images which elicited most identification were the three which included a context of young animals in kinship (or being separated from it) with their parents (Images 2, 3 and 5). Video 3 was also effective for some participants as they were shocked to see a cow appear to cry, even if this was commonly questioned in terms of authenticity/anthropomorphism.

“Is it crying, or is its eye just watering?”  
“Yeah, I didn’t think it was crying”  
(FG1 21:52 – 21:56)

“I’m not sure cows are that intelligent”  
(FG1 23:15)

“Was it even crying, full stop?”  
(FG3 26:37)

**But later:**

“I did feel sad at the beginning. It made me think of my dog”

“Cows eyes are quite sad, aren’t they?”

“Yeah”

“If it had been a sheep it wouldn’t have been the same”

(FG1 25:51 – 26:02)

Representations of piglets, lambs and calves potentially suffering either via separation or a perception of impending slaughter were powerful across the focus groups. However, participants were generally critically aware of feeling emotionally manipulated and often would question the context of the animal images in order to lessen the potential moral severity of what they were seeing. This could suggest the importance of having a strong clear narrative in order to make it less likely viewers will construct their own more comfortable script.

“Yeah I’ve assumed that it’s [a new-born crying for its mum]. Actually, that could just be that poor little calf has accidentally got, like fallen under the fence and needs rescuing or something, it could just be a ranch or something” (FG3 44:45).

“See for me that was just like, oh silly cow, he’s just gone under the fence” (FG4 43:52)

Nevertheless, the parental/maternal relationship dimension did seem to be an effective message across the FGs. There were moments of acute identification from these images. For example, from the lambs (image 3):

“I don’t want to eat these guys”

“They’re so beautiful”

(FG2 48:09/10)

As well as in the dog extract above (FG2 44:25) there were further moments when FG participants related the treatment of the farmed animals they were viewing to their companion animals.

“I struggle to see the difference between that cow and my little cat” (FG2 26:30).

Clearly vegan advocacy has for many years tried to draw upon companion animal relations as a model for a more consistent animal ethics. This can be effective sometimes, but dominant cultural constructions of different animals (companion versus farmed) often mitigate against this as a productive pathway toward veganism. Occasionally the identification travelled not only to companion animals but to relating to participants' own children or children generally. Again, on the lamb example (image 3):

"The adult one is bleating. Its mouth is wide open and it's shouting. I've got a two-year-old son and it makes me think if I was separated from my son, I'd be absolutely livid" (FG2 48:56)

"I mean, yeah, you can say they do have a bit of space. But if you imagine that's kids in that much space then it's not, sort of..." (FG5 33:07 in relation to image one)

Occasionally participants would allude to perceptions of intelligence in relation to particular animals. We have already noted descriptors such as 'silly' and questioning the intelligence of cows. More positively there were perceptions of higher intelligence in pigs:

"And like everyone says how smart pigs are. Like there's no stimulation there at all and it's nothing" (FG5 43:27).

This suggests that underlying constructions of animals minds can be relevant when presenting specific species.

## **Narrative and Access to Information**

One of the key overarching commonalities amongst the focus groups was the participants' high levels of cynicism regarding the content, context and purpose of the videos and images they were asked to engage with. These barriers appear to be heightened when there is no narrative involved. For example, when interacting with the still images (appendices A-E) participants consistently questioned and scrutinised images to construct their own narratives, often based on misinformation or misunderstandings around meat and dairy farming practices. Despite often indicating a sadness regarding the conditions in which the animals in images 1, 2, 3, and 5 were kept, participants came up with their own explanations for the necessity of their setup:

"I think that's the thing with the sheep as well is just that we don't know what's going to happen to them, like they're probably just going to get that out into the grass and stuff" (FG5 51:17).

“The farmer behind this is probably not horrible person that's like, oh, I hate chickens, I'm going to put them all in a shed. They're probably thinking I need to feed my family and I need to keep my farm alive. So, this is how; the way I'm going to make any money is putting them in this horrible position. And do we know what chickens feel like? I don't know” (FG1 37:57).

Context can, if ‘misaligned’ cause participants to feel ‘manipulated’. Anthropomorphising was referenced both explicitly and implicitly across the FGs. When mentioned explicitly, examples of anthropomorphising were met with cynicism:

“I'm not saying that animals don't cry, I'm just saying we don't know what led to that shot of the tears coming out of the animal's eye and I felt manipulated, because I don't know how that was done. I'd like to have seen the process that led to that starting so I could have made my own judgement on why it was crying” (FG3 26:42).

However, implicitly, participants commonly anthropomorphised naturally, particularly in the case of parent-child imagery (Images 2, 3 and 5).

Context is necessary not only to alleviate doubt as to the trustworthiness of the contents of the image, but also to educate or inform the realities of meat and dairy farming. Context in the form of narrative can help to reduce the aforementioned barriers. Narrative can also aid in creating scenarios that allow the audience to identify with a message. For example, the Tesco advert (video 2) reminded participants of home life and similar situations they had experienced or could imagine.

As well as informing and educating the realities of animal farming, narratives can be employed to convey the realities of a vegan lifestyle. For example, participants often described a perception that a plant-based lifestyle was discouragingly expensive:

“If you think about how expensive your shop would go from buying a packet of chicken thighs which are like 2 quid to buying all vegan alternatives” (FG2 33:53).

“I know how much more expensive is going vegan and I see it every single day at home, and maybe I'm living my happy little life not being vegan, but I am not spending ridiculous amount of money on ridiculous foods” (FG6 25:27).

However, the participants noted the ‘accessible’ and ‘achievable’ options put forward by the Tesco advert. The notion of a ‘simple swap’ was echoed across the FGs:

“something like that [video] kind of makes you think well, that's an easy swap. So why not?” (FG2 19:18).

“I particularly like that advert because it's showing people like my traditional mother-in-law that actually it's a simple swap to have something with meat or without meat and actually tasted as good” (FG3 14:28).

“So I think it's really positive that, that type of thing is, in 30 seconds, showing people how they can make an easy change” (FG3 15:08).

“it was good to show how easy it was to make the swap as well” (FG5 12:28).

“It's a small change. Which is maybe the message as well, just make these small changes” (FG1 15:05).

Although narratives enabled contextual and educational information, which helped to reduce the barriers to vegan messages, they were also subject to misinterpretation and did have negative consequences. The Tesco advert, though received positively by a majority, elicited a negative response with some participants who noted that the message was idealised and inspired guilt by promoting unrealistic standards for parents. Participants were also highly sceptical regarding both the author and the agenda of videos and images. This was the case when the author and agenda were known and unknown. For example, the Tesco advert was criticised for being a marketing ploy; “Tesco's do not care at all” (FG3 14:08). Image 2, meanwhile, was criticised for being ‘staged’ or ‘set up’. This mistrust is also directly linked to evidence of overt agendas, with participants commonly referring to their dislike of having someone else’s belief ‘pushed’ or “‘thrust’ on them. Additionally, some participants referenced their aversion to narratives that appeared to – or did – show images that they found distressing, i.e. animal ‘torture’. These participants suggested that, faced with these images, they would actively disengage.

## **Parent and child relationship**

### **Overt and covert**

The parent/child relationship was explicitly used in the Tesco advert (video 2) to highlight the connection between animals and food. In each focus group, this approach to animal ethics was received positively, with participants reporting feeling ‘warm’ ‘nice’ ‘homely’.

This appeared to reflect the narrative of the advert and the parent/child bond as can be seen in the below statement:

“I just liked the line where he said, I love my meat, but I love my little girl more. That just gave me like a warm feeling and it felt nice and like oh that's really nice, he's putting his child before [himself] and going with what she wants.” (FG3 19:46)

A number of participants commented on the father figure in relation to his ability as a parent ‘he’s a good dad’ ‘He was obviously a lovely dad’. In addition, a number of participants spoke favourably about the father figure within the context of the family household and some particularly liked that the father was doing the cooking:

“I really liked that it was a single dad cooking for a daughter. That's a big tick for me. Diversity.” (FG1 13:39)  
Playing “to the modern non-traditional family” (FG1 13:45)  
“It is nice that the dynamic's changed because you expected the mum to be the one who's cooking” (FG4 17:07)

In contrast, 3 of the images (2, 3 and 5) portrayed animal ethics using the parent/child bond in a more covert way. Interestingly, these images were ranked as the most emotional in 4 of the 6 focus groups (Fig 4). In each focus group this predominately evoked negative emotions ‘desperately sad’, ‘upsetting’ and ‘heart-breaking’.

Reasons for these negative emotions were expressed in relation to the bond between a mother and her baby. Participants appeared to identify with the cow (image 2) and ewe (image 3) being separated from their young:

“So that just makes me feel desperately sad and just thinking of even just being a mum and if you had your baby taken away from you and you've got milk and your instinct is to feed your baby” (FG6 36:29)

However, at times this was met with some scepticism:

“It makes me feel sad because I've got a one year old so like, the thought of him being behind a bar that I couldn't reach is just horrifying. But I'm not totally convinced it's not a stunt. You know? Like, is it? Is it real? I mean, I'm more sad about the fact it looks like such a desolate environment for a cow. Like where's the grass? You know, you think what cow would be happy? Regardless of being separated from its calf? Doesn't look a very pleasant environment for cow anyway.” (FG1 43:04)

In addition, in the image of the sheep (image 3), a couple of participants were less concerned about the separation between the parent and child. This appeared to reflect the proximity and the more natural environment the animals were presented in. In addition, the dynamic nature of image 3 was at times perceived as ‘playful’ or ‘funny’, albeit by the minority. This could partially explain the lower ranking of image 3 (sheep) in the remaining 2 focus groups (FG 1 and 3, Fig 4).

### **Family life**

Interestingly, some participants reflected on the parent/child dynamics within the Tesco advert (video 2) in relation to their own experiences (see narrative and access to information) as a parent or child in a similar situation.

While the message in the video was considered by many participants as ‘positive’, ‘inspirational’ or ‘achievable (for parents to implement)’, this view was not unanimous.

“It was respectful, wasn't it? Because a lot of time you hear parents going, oh well they've gone vegetarian what am I going to feed them? It was really upbeat, really respectful and quite inspirational.’ (FG3 20:00)

‘It's you know, your average kind of like working class on a budget and it's like, actually, this is doable for your bog standard person” (FG4 23:48)

Some participants suggested that the message was idealised (see narrative and access to information) and that it did not reflect their own experiences.

“For me when I went home, I got told it was a phase. And then I had a separate meal. There was not everybody had it, I had a separate meal. So, actually in theory, what happened is my mum's food bill doubled. Because she then had to go out and buy the things that I could eat

and then the things that everybody else still ate.” (FG4 17:56)

“I feel a bit guilty when I see the advert because I think of this little girl who's now 24 when she came to me and said she wanted to be vegetarian and she didn't get that response. She got: what you're going to eat? Come on, chips and mash? I don't think so, here's your chicken.” (FG1 14:03)

## Celebrity

As mentioned, video 1 and image 4 featured the vegan celebrity Joaquin Phoenix who is presently culturally prominent due to his role in the recent film, Joker. Two groups out of 6 ranked his video as the most emotionally connective or impactful. Overall responses were rather mixed. There was a degree of cynicism in that he was seen as a privileged celebrity who was in a better position to make choices and he was also criticised for what was perceived as anthropomorphic and strident language.

“I thought there was a level of - I think this is the right word - "anthropomorphication"? Where he was putting human qualities onto animals: human feelings and human emotions. That sprung to my mind. I'm sure he's anthropomorphised - if that's the word. He talks about taking the babies away and we don't know if animals have those same kinds of emotions. I'm not saying they don't - perhaps they do and I just don't know - but I just thought there was a level of putting our own view of emotions as humans onto animals like fish” (FG1 4:27)

“It wasn't enough to make me think I need to stop eating meat now. I don't know much about him as an actor. I know he's obviously celebrity, but it didn't inspire me to go oh my goodness, what am I doing eating meat, I need to stop. Maybe it just used a bit too much of his celebrity status rather than evidence: why it's good, why it's bad, why we should stop” (FG1 6:10)

“...he used the words “barbaric” and “abusive” and they're quite emotive ways of discussing it and it does feel like it being thrust upon you. It looked bit like he had distaste on his face, and it was off-putting for me a little bit for me, that; because he looks so angry about it” (FG1 10:25)

“It just makes me roll my eyes when there's a celebrity involved” (FG6 0:40)

The video included footage of a protest march with protestors, including Phoenix, carrying dead animals. Several participants found this a bit upsetting, although others reported liking the hard-hitting element of this. Others noted approvingly the passion with which he spoke. Whilst some received his words as patronising others were more positive:

“I think it's more he just spoke intelligently, and he's got a lot of integrity and that's quite- it's just quite compelling because it's not shouty. I didn't feel like he was judging me I felt I followed his you know his journey and it's hard to argue with”

“It wasn't preachy”

“Yeah”

“Exactly” (FG5 7:13-27)

As the video includes some discussion of non-food dimensions of veganism such as clothing this did lead to a fair bit of focus group reflection on leather and wool. This appeared as quite educational as an issue that several participants had not given much thought to previously, sometimes eliciting feelings of guilt:

“I'm sat here cringing I've got my leather shoes on” (FG5 4:08)

Occasionally his celebrity status was effectively downplayed. Although the video makes clear he has been vegan since the age of three, several participants explained away his veganism as the result of coming from an ‘alternative’ family. This might imply that celebrity status whilst sometimes effective can also reinforce a perception of difference to ‘everyday people’. Image 4 was uniformly low impact with every focus group ranking it lowest of all the images. These findings on cases of celebrity should be read alongside the prior focus groups reported on in the larger pathways report (Parkinson *et. al.* 2019). These included a broader array of celebrities. Although many of these were also endorsing health aspects of veganism rather than just animal ethics arguments we also then found an ambivalent mixture of participant ‘celebrity cynicism’ but also combined with a curiosity over celebrity lifestyle as a gateway to learning about a vegan lifestyle and the overall social normalisation effect of vegan practices which celebrities can contribute to.

After completing our review of the themes from the focus group data, we have produced the following set of recommendations for both The Vegan Society and the company employed to produce the advert. Our team will be happy to answer questions of advice or clarification from either.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The samples featuring pigs/piglets, cows/calf, sheep/lambs all had some success in eliciting sympathetic identification. However, in choosing one animal species there is a risk in losing large segments of audience.
- There was rather clear evidence that chickens/birds were seen by many of our participants as at the bottom of a hierarchy of animals that we presented to them. This would suggest that chickens would be a poor choice of animal if the attempt was to elicit moral identification and ethical reflexivity.
- Participants were generally critically aware of feeling emotionally manipulated and often would question the context of the animal images in order to lessen the potential moral severity of what they were seeing. This would suggest that it would be risky to construct an advertisement

which could be interpreted as 'emotional manipulation'. Also, a strong clear narrative can lessen the likelihood of viewers constructing more palatable readings of what they are viewing.

- Vegan celebrities are often subject to scepticism but also curiosity. Due to the complex ambivalent response to celebrity reported here and in the broader pathways project, careful thought would have to be given to the use of celebrity. Engaged viewers are likely to be cynical toward the use of celebrity generally and their social otherness may compound the perceived otherness and unobtainability of vegan practices.
- Narratives are an effective way of communicating context and increasing trust and awareness. However, "stories" should not be designed to elicit guilt and should, instead, offer factual, objective information and "simple swaps" or relatable scenarios and relationships (i.e. parent/child, pet/owner).
- Furthermore, the solution-focused approach (i.e. presenting swaps for the family) to veganism was embraced by the majority of participants and many indicated that they would try the swap suggested in the Tesco advert. This strongly suggests that promotional materials need to go beyond raising awareness and present user-friendly advice that can be implemented within the context of family commitments and routines.
- It may be possible or even preferable to convey animal ethics messages in such a way that does not obviously include (real) representations of nonhuman animals, with the Tesco advert being one such example.
- Overt agendas cause resistance, whereas subtle or objective messages with achievable, actionable suggestions were favoured.
- Overt anthropomorphising or scenarios read as being anthropomorphic (e.g. emotions attached to the cow in video 3) produced cynicism however; anthropomorphism can be a natural outcome when individuals view subtle images of animals with their offspring or acting in a manner typically associated with pets (e.g. images 2, 3 and 5).
- Shocking or distressing imagery often leads to active disengagement.
- Parent/child relationships evoke strong emotions that may promote change, but this needs to be sensitive to the family dynamic/characteristics i.e. non-traditional families, realistic and not idealised. Therefore, a real family experience may be useful in any promotional materials.
- Although the images and videos were used to explore opinions about animals and food, many participants raised other issues such as diversity, familial gender roles and climate change. This indicates that promotional materials may be able to tackle more than one issue.
- Participants often alluded to systems of production and the wider food system. We feel this could be an argument against an advertisement that only or over focuses on the individual as the locus for change and ignores policymakers, institutions, corporations and government. This could be done partly by informing viewers of some of the broader activities of The Vegan Society in this vein.

## References

Guest, G., Namey, E. & K. McKenna (2017) 'How Many Focus Groups Are Enough? Building an Evidence Base for Nonprobability Sample Sizes', *Field Studies*, 29 (1): 3-22.

Parkinson, C., Twine, R., and N. Griffin (2019) Pathways to Veganism: Exploring Effective Messages in Vegan Transition. Final Report, Edge Hill University.

## Appendices

Images 1-5 have been removed from appendices