

INTERVENTION

Increase the availability of vegetarian meals by swapping one meat-based meal for one vegetarian meal.

MECHANISMS

Liking/ preference

Increased likelihood that a vegetarian meal is the most liked meal on offer.

Social norms

More vegetarian dishes on offer might convey social norm of vegetarian preference.¹

Positioning

Increased likelihood that a vegetarian meal is positioned in a way that either draws customers' attention or makes a meal easier to access.

Price

Increased likelihood that a vegetarian meal is the cheapest meal on offer.²

POTENTIAL OUTCOMES

Direct outcomes

Main intended outcome

More vegetarian and fewer meat meal purchases in worksite cafeterias

Cafeterias may choose to continue with altered menus post-intervention

Reduced environmental and health impact of worksite cafeteria meal purchases.³

Revenue gains in cafeterias⁴

Increased willingness in key stakeholders to engage in future interventions.

Indirect outcomes

Desired outcomes

Increased acceptance and preference for vegetarian meals at work and in other settings.⁸

Increased vegetarian food purchases and consumption at home. This could have possible knock-on effects on other household members.⁹

Facilitates formation of healthy and sustainable eating habits

Wider outcomes

Change in social norms: vegetarian meals become more 'normal' for meat eaters to consume

Reduction in wholesale meat alternative prices due to increased vegetarian food purchases

Positive environmental and health outcomes for people and planet

Undesired outcomes

Customers buy more meat from other menu sections (e.g. snacks)

Customer dissatisfaction and potential loss of customers to other food outlets⁵

No (or negative) impact on environmental and health outcomes if vegetarian meals sold are less sustainable and healthy than meat meals⁶

Increased food waste from unsold dishes.

Revenue loss in cafeterias⁷

Customers (over-)compensate for lack of meat by eating more meat at home. This could have possible knock-on effects on other household members.⁹

Reduced willingness in key stakeholders to engage in future interventions.

'Leakage' of sustainability efforts: companies becoming less committed to other sustainability work because cafeteria menus have made them seem more sustainable.

None foreseen

Assumptions

- 1 – Social norms of vegetarian meal preference is affected by number of vegetarian meals on offer.
- 2 – Vegetarian meals are generally cheaper to purchase than meat-based meals.
- 3 – On average, meat-based meals have higher environmental and health impacts than vegetarian meals.
- 4 – Revenue gains may occur if vegetarian meals have larger profit margins (e.g. due to cheaper ingredients) than meat meals
- 5 – Other food outlets are available to customers
- 6 – Although vegetarian meals are on average healthier and more sustainable than meat-based meals, the specific vegetarian dishes sold during the trial may not be, for example if they contain high amounts of dairy products, replacing meals based on healthier and more sustainable meats like chicken.
- 7 – Revenue loss may occur if vegetarian meals have smaller profit margins than meat meals or if customers eat at other places.
- 8 – Low preference and acceptance of vegetarian food is currently one of the main barriers to its consumption
- 9 – Consumer in the trial has (some) control over food shopping for their household