

**Conflict among social norms of different groups and their effects on consumer behavior**

**CRISTINA M. OSTERMANN**

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL (UFRGS)

**ANA LUIZA BROCK**

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL (UFRGS)

# **Conflict among social norms of different groups and their effects on consumer behavior**

## **1. Introduction**

The challenges related to climate change require a structural change in the economic chain, from production to consumption, including habits and dietary choices of individuals. Food is one of the three most critical consumer sectors in terms of impact and harm to the environment (Lehner et al., 2016), and there is increasing social pressure for changes in diet, especially in meat consumption patterns (Cheah et al., 2020). Meat production, especially intensive, has been identified as one of the leading causes of emission of polluting gases into the atmosphere, land and water use, and transformation of ecosystems, leading decrease in biodiversity (The Lancet, 2018). Reduction of consumption, substitution by proteins of plant origin, or alternative origins, such as laboratory meats, and/or substitution by meats of animals raised in agroecological systems are alternatives to reduce environmental impacts (Machovina et al., 2015).

Changes related to meat consumption are challenging due to their importance in nutrition, survival, and the social representations and symbolic meaning of food and meals (Rozin, 2005). Meat is one of the most important food in the human diet and is largely consumed all over the world: it is intrinsic in habits, rituals, traditions, and personal and collective expression (Leroy & Praet, 2015). Eating meat is part of the dominant dietary habit in many societies and is considered the social norm in most areas of the world (Soule & Sekhon, 2019).

Humans are social beings by nature and live in a complex social environment, which influences essential decisions, such as those related to food (Suzanne Higgs, 2015). Each person is a member of different social groups concomitantly, and participating in a social group is part of personal identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). By social groups, individuals evaluate and categorize themselves and guide how they should behave and what they should believe (Hogg, 2016).

Groups present a single and specific system of social norms that must be followed to confirm and maintain the affiliation (Fritsche et al., 2018). However, social norms from different groups can be significant, salient, and incompatible at the same time, which can lead to normative conflicts (Amiot et al., 2020; Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Normative conflict occurs when two or more valued identities stand out at the same time and have divergent norms, and individuals are aware of the divergence and realize that this difference can lead to a situation that harms their social relationships (Giguère et al., 2010; Hirsh & Kang, 2016). In a normative conflict situation, individuals use cognitive activities and behavior as strategies to harmonize identities but are not clear what the effect of incompatible normative standards in consumer behavior.

Despite the relevance of the focus theory of normative conduct theory (Cialdini et al., 1990) to understand and predict intentions and behaviors, the conflict of social norms among groups and its effect on behavior has been neglected by previous research on consumer behavior area. There is a limited number of academic works discussing situations of conflict of social norms between different groups in the Marketing area, and studies with empirical data are scarce. To the best of our knowledge, there is no published academic study on the conflict of social norms in the context of consumer behavior. To collaborate in solving this gap, this essay aims to explore the conflict of social norms between different groups on consumption behavior, using meat consumption as the context of the study. As a result, we propose questions that can guide future research.

The theoretical contribution expected lies in the development of the Focus theory of normative conduct theory, exploring the effect of normative conflicts between different

groups on the eating behavior domain, focusing on meat consumption behavior, which has not been explored in previous research. Besides scientific contributions, studies on meat consumption are addressed to society demand related to environmental challenges. Considering that this theory is considered effective in understanding and changing human behaviors in a social context, it could aid in the development of more effective actions that result in more ethical and sustainable behaviors related to dietary choices.

The results may also support the formulation of public policies on nutrition and food, especially related to meat consumption. They will collaborate with business and economic activity, once changes in meat consumption have effects on the economy, especially in meat producing and exporting countries. Changes in consumption patterns also influence global value chains, which need to adapt to new scenarios. There is a demand for more flow and quality of information for decision-making and innovation in production, distribution, and retail processes. The economic and social importance of the livestock chain is relevant in producing, consuming, and exporting countries such as Brazil.

## **2. Social identity, group affiliation, and social norms**

Humans are social beings by nature, and the social environment has an essential influence on who a person is (Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Each person has a complex psychological system – self-concept - that encompasses a set of identities constructed from the interaction between personal characteristics and the social environment (Amiot et al., 2007). This set of identities organize previous experience and manifest social roles, determining who a person was, is, and who may become in the future, and is considered a strong predictor of future choices and behavior (Oyserman, 2009b). Identities are hierarchically organized (Dermody et al., 2018) and relative stable (Oyserman, 2009a; Swann Jr., 1983). Insofar as they are embedded within the social context, they can be adaptable, malleable, and situation-sensitive (Oyserman, 2009a; Reed et al., 2012).

Self-concept represents thoughts and feelings about yourself and results from the fusion of perspective of others (extrinsic) to yourself perspective (intrinsic) about yourself (Swann Jr., 1983). The intrinsic perspective and personal characteristics, such as personality and traits, are highly particular and unique and are effected and affected by the social environment (Oyserman, 2009a). The construction of components of the self-concept is environmentally and culturally contextualized, immersed in the social context, based on relationships, social roles played, and group memberships (Terry et al., 1999).

According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), individuals segment, categorize, and classify the social environment through groups, and to categorize themselves as part of the environment from group affiliation (Terry et al., 1999). Self-categorization enables the relative perception of the individual's position and a broader understanding of the role in the social system (Abrams & Hogg, 1990). This process occurs through the identification with a specific group and its members, highlighting intragroup cohesion, and by comparing the similarities and differences of that group with the other groups of the social system, resulting in intergroup differentiation (Terry et al., 1999).

Group affiliation results in following a specific prototype, which guides behavior, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings (Hogg, 2016). The group prototype is influenced by a single, particular, and shared normative system, and members of a specific group are expected to act according to the group's norms (Fritsche et al., 2018; McDonald et al., 2013). These norms are called social norms and must be followed to confirm and maintain affiliation. It is a prevalent behavior in the community, and this prevalence is known by the members (Hawkins et al., 2019).

Social norms are negotiated rules and patterns to regulate social behaviors, communicated, and understood by members of a specific group (Cialdini et al., 1990). Guides or restrict behaviors and conducts, although they are not supported by a formal system of laws (Cialdini & Trost, 1998), and this influence on behavior is underdetected by people (Nolan et al., 2008). Social norms are shared among group members actively, by instructions, demonstration, rituals, or passively, in a nonverbal way or by observation and imitation (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). The normative information can be directly communicated by other group members' behavior and opinions or indirectly by communicated information about a group and signals sent from social institutions (Yamin et al., 2019).

From a functional point of view, the strength of social norms derives from the inherited ability to survive as an individual and as a group, and the adaptive and psychological need to belong to a community (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Yamin et al., 2019). McDonald & Crandall (2015) highlight that social norms have a biological basis, considering human's evolutionary history and neurological structure, but these are learned and reinforced by a psychological process embedded in the social and cultural context. Social norms are part of the culture and work as group cohesiveness by shared customs, traditions, standards, rules, and values (Cialdini and Trost, 1998).

From this sociocultural context, different types of social norms emerge in the source of motivation (Cialdini et al., 1990; Hamann et al., 2015), despite that social pressure is a common motive to adherence to social norms (Thøgersen, 2006). Descriptive norms are standard social behaviors, following what the group's colleagues do and are learned by observation and imitation (Cialdini et al., 1990; Miller & Prentice, 2016). Represents what behavior is "normal" (Thøgersen, 2006) and guides behavioral choices when the situation is new or unclear. Injunctive norms - also called prescriptive norms (Hawkins et al., 2019) - are related to socially valued behaviors resulting from approval or disapproval by their group peers, and that determines what should and what should not be done. Sanctions or the feeling of moral sanctions are the main motivational component of this type of norm. Thøgersen (2006) suggests that in terms of levels of internalization and integration with the self, descriptive norms are more strongly related to the external environment while injunctive norms are more introject.

Both descriptive and injunctive norms influence beliefs and behaviors (Smith & Louis, 2008). Still, their alignment can result in a more substantial effect on behavioral change compared to using a norm alone (Schultz et al., 2018). On the other hand, the misalignment between descriptive and injunctive norms can weaken their effects on consumer behavior (Hamann et al., 2015). Injunctive norms are considered more powerful and general. Also, exert more significant transsituational influence than descriptive norms (Cialdini et al., 1990; Kallgren et al., 2000), and in the situation of conflict between descriptive and injunctive norms, injunctive overlap descriptive norms (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Plows et al., 2017).

The strength of social norms is influenced by the degree of individual's identification with the group and salience of the norm or group membership (Goldstein et al., 2008; Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Regarding salience of the norm, both the theory of the focus of normative conduct and the theory of social identity recognize that norms are not uniform in force at all times, and salience reinforces the effect of the norm, in a theoretical alignment (Hirsh & Kang, 2016).

However, there a difference between the theories. By the lens of focus theory of normative conduct, in some situations, cues and signals activate a specific norm, increasing their effectiveness (Cialdini et al., 1990). Considering social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and the multiple social group identification (Amiot et al., 2020), the context can highlight an affiliation and social identity of a specific group. When a specific social identity is highlighted by environmental cues, group norms are also

highlighted concerning other group norms at that particular time and context, affecting the behavioral impact of the group norm highlighted (Abrams et al., 1990). So, by this lens, the salience of the norm is a result of the salience of affiliation and social identity.

Besides salience, group identification is important to norm adherence. Perceived similarity (Rimal et al., 2005), group's meaningfulness to the individual (Goldstein et al., 2008), affinity and desire to connect with a reference group (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005) and the importance of the group for the self-concept (Hirsh and Kang, 2016) influence the strength of group identification. The higher the identification with some group, the greater the adherence to group social norms (Hirsh & Kang, 2016) and, consequently, greater is the engagement with the behavior related to the norm (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005).

### **3. Different groups, different norms: exploring the social norm conflict**

Group memberships and social identities definition are defined by many factors, including nationality, peer group, family, friendship group (Higgs, 2015), gender, race, culture, sexual orientation, and political preferences (Hirsh & Kang, 2016). So, a person is concomitantly affiliated with and influenced by different social groups and is exposed to different normative expectations (Amiot et al., 2020; Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Considering the norm as a group standard (McDonald & Crandall, 2015), it is reasonable to expect that groups have different norms among themselves (McDonald et al., 2013). Intragroup comparison, as a process of self-categorization and a process of self-concept, also reinforces the contrast among groups. Social norms can be important and incompatible at the same time, which can lead to normative conflicts (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Fritsche et al., 2018; Hirsh & Kang, 2016).

Normative conflict occurs when two or more valued identities are salient at the same time, have different norms, individuals are aware of the divergence, and realize that this difference can lead to a situation that harms their social relationships (Giguère et al., 2010; Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Failure to comply with a group's norms puts the affiliation in risk and causes physical and emotional results, triggering a neurophysiological response that produces anxiety and uncertainty (Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Salience and group identification affects the social norm strength, and it is essential to consider these factors in a normative-conflict situation. However, Hirsh and Kang (2016) affirm that more than one group identity may be salient at the same time. Also, deep identification with more than one group simultaneously can occur, highlighting identities simultaneously and resulting in an identity conflict (Gibson et al., 2020).

Divergence among norms results in identity conflict or incongruity, threatening self-concept (Stryker & Burke, 2010; Swann Jr., 1983). Individuals use cognitive activities and behavior as strategies to solve this situation and ensure stability (Reed et al., 2012). Potential reactions are to switch between identities (Giguère et al., 2010), to suppress one of the conflicting identity, deny the identity conflict, and to enhance a dominant identity (Hirsh & Kang, 2016).

One possible strategy to enhance a dominant identity is compensatory consumption of products and/or services, to enhance a specific identity (Coleman et al., 2019). If a compensatory consumption behavior is a direct strategy, scholars see the act of avoiding consumption also as a manifestation of the self-identity and indirect strategy to reinforce self-concept. Consumption reduction, avoidance, or rejection are practices (or non-practices) of anti-consumption and self-expression, taking a distance from undesired Self (García-de-Frutos et al., 2018).

As norms exert influence in decision making and behavior (Newell et al., 2014; Rilling & Sanfey, 2011), norm-conflict among groups may interfere in this influence process. However, there is a limited number of empirical researches about conflict among social norms of different groups in the consumer behavior area. Social Psychology

presents a more considerable amount of studies. In Management, there is empirical research related to identity conflict (and, consequently, social norm conflict) in organizational behavior (e.g., Cooper & Thatcher, 2010), and in sustainable behavior.

Regarding sustainable behavior, results of researches carried out by on environmental decisions domain (McDonald et al., 2013, 2014b, 2014a) suggest that descriptive normative conflict can motivate or demotivate intentions and behavioral engagement, depending on the degree of incongruence among groups' norms, individual's environmental attitudes, and their perceived effectiveness. Fritsche et al. (2018) argue that the conflict among multiple ingroups norms can both weaken or strengthen norm influence. Conflicts are positively associated with pro-environmental action when personal pro-environmental attitudes are strong, resulting in personal relevance or commitment.

#### **4. Sustainable diet and food consumption behavior**

Food consumption is a field of study that has received growing attention due to the environmental impact of food production and consumption chain. Food is one of the three most critical consumer sectors in terms of impact and harm to the environment (Lehner, Mont, & Heiskanen, 2016). Globally, it is responsible for 30% of energy consumption and 22% of greenhouse gas emissions (UN, 2015; Willits-Smith et al., 2020). Changes in diet patterns are necessary to limit the damage to the environment and goal of a healthy diet, considering the projected world population in 2050, about 10 billion habitants (Springmann et al., 2018).

New dietary guidance going beyond nutritional necessities and health but considering environmental and social impacts (e.g., Willits-Smith et al., 2020). Also, sustainable diets must take into account social impact - as rights, equity, markets, access to resources, food traditions, gender, class, race, among others - (Jones et al., 2016) and economic, ethical, and cultural aspects (Springmann et al., 2018). The dietarian shift recommendation includes a 50% reduction in global consumption of food considered unhealthy, as meat and sugar (Willett et al., 2019) and an increase in consumption of plant-based aliments, alternative protein (as insects), and seasonal and organic products (Vermeir et al., 2020). These changes have a significant impact on human health, considering both the obesity epidemic and chronic disease mortality and underweight and malnutrition (Springmann et al., 2018; Wright & Bragge, 2018). In terms of environmental impact, sustainable diets target in a food production that reduce climate change, freshwater use, biodiversity loss, land-system change and preserve nitrogen and phosphorus cycles (Willett et al., 2019).

Consumers can engage jointly or in two strategies for sustainable food consumption: to choose products in which production is more sustainable or change the dietary pattern of food intake (Verain et al., 2015). The first strategy can be considered an efficient behavior strategy, as the consumer seeks to maintain his original food intake scheme but seeks to reduce the impact of consumption, choosing organic products, free-range meat, fairly traded, among other options (Soule & Sekhon, 2019). The second strategy involves eliminating or curtail consumption of some category of food, e.g., stop eat or reduce meat consumption (Verain et al., 2015).

All in all, changes in eating patterns are challenging and hard to achieve due to the complexity of eating activity (Vermeir et al., 2020). As pointed by (Sobal et al., 2014), "eating is as a multifaceted, contextual, dynamic, multilevel, integrated, and diverse activity" (p.6), encompassing "physical, biological, psychological, and sociocultural levels" (p.8). Additionally, previous research identified an attitude-behavior gap regarding the purchase of sustainable food products (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006),

which differs from the consumer behavior process described in the consumer behavior theory.

Food choice involves multiple daily decisions, and the context shapes it (Sobal et al., 2014). In a multi-perspective view, food choice is more complex than an individual decision: habits and social structures, as family, groups, organizations, and culture are mainly determinant (Klößner, 2017; Sobal et al., 2014).

Food choice is a social process and plays an essential role in social dynamics as an expression of group identity (Rosenfeld & Tomiyama, 2019). As group affiliation and social identity processes are connected to follow group social norms (Hogg, 2016), social norms affect eating behavior (Stok et al., 2018). The influence of social norms on eating behavior is well recognized (Eker et al., 2019; Suzanne Higgs & Thomas, 2016). Besides the role of groups and social norms on self-identity and self-concept previously discussed, the influence of social norms on eating behavior also is a consequence of two interdependent functions: adaptive functions and social and personal meanings functions (Neuman, 2019). Evolutionary and adaptive functions increase the influence of norms on behavior because group norms help guide the selection of the correct type and quantity of food. Thus, the group's rules assist in survival and allow cooperation and the sharing of social functions among group members, as a tool to support social judgment (Cruwys et al., 2015; Higgs, 2015). Eating behavior and food consumption have a role that goes beyond food intake to survive because of its nutritional aspects (Rozin, 2005).

Previous research has identified moderators and mediators' variables that influence the effect of social norms eating behavior. Regarding moderators, studies have identified factors from both personal and social dimensions. Self-control, impulsivity, gender, food preferences, self-control, self-esteem, outcome expectations (e.g., benefits to oneself, to others and anticipatory socialization), ego-involvement, and habit strength are examples of personal factors (Suzanne Higgs & Thomas, 2016; Lapinski & Rimal, 2005; Stok et al., 2018). Factors external to the person, related to the social dimension, are similarity with the model (referent person) and with the group, type of the social norm, group identity (similarity and aspiration), identification with the group, among others (Cruwys et al., 2015; Suzanne Higgs & Thomas, 2016; Lapinski & Rimal, 2005; Stok et al., 2016, 2018). Mediators are rarely studied, and examples are rare (Sotk et al., 2018).

The factors presented above do not intend to exhaust the mediating and moderating variables described by the literature, but rather to propose some reflections. First, there are factors from personal and social dimensions. Second, as pointed out by Stok et al. (2018), there is a tendency in researches on eating behavior to investigate moderators, showing an opportunity to explore mediators' relations empirically between social norms and eating behavior. The authors also suggest that "there is not yield evidence of strong mediators or moderators of the social norm effect on eating behavior" (Stok et al., 2018, p.738). Lastly, the descriptive norm appears to be more effective than the injunctive norm in influencing eating behavior as a moderator (S. Higgs et al., 2019; Robinson et al., 2014).

#### **4.1. Meat consumption**

The eating behavior complexity takes on another dimension concerning meat consumption. Meat intake was necessary for human evolution as a species, providing a small portion of food with a large portion of nutrients essential for the development of physical and cognitive abilities (Milton, 1999). Also, eating meat has social and cultural importance, highlighted by the symbolic meaning that involves the death and meat intake of another living being. The omnivorous diet is the social norm in most countries and is widely accepted culturally in many societies (Macdiarmid et al., 2016; Soule & Sekhon, 2019).

Meat consumption is a path to the expression and reinforcement of social identities, especially masculinity, strength, wealth, and social status (Bastian & Loughnan, 2017; De Backer et al., 2020; Macdiarmid et al., 2016). As a current norm, deviant meat-eating behaviors cause social reactions not verified to the consumption of other foods. For example, vegans suffer discrimination for not following standard eating behavior, as vegaphobia (Vandermoere et al., 2019), and stigmatization (Markowski & Roxburgh, 2019).

According to Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt (2017), multiple factors influence meat behavior, both in personal and external (sociocultural) levels. Attitudes are described as necessary in the process of consumer behavior in a context of conflict. Nevertheless, despite negative attitudes about meat intake (Vandermoere et al., 2019) and a crescent intention to reduce meat consumption (Apostolidis & McLeay, 2019), few succeed in effectively change the eating pattern. Macdiarmid et al. (2016) affirm that meat-eaters face a paradox: although they have negative attitudes about eating meat, they are unwilling to change diary habits.

From a biological point of view, the human being is an omnivorous animal. However, despite the biological ability to eat meat, people can make a personal choice whether or not to eat meat. The literature describes the dietary patterns related to meat intake into categories that vary between authors. For example, (Springmann et al., 2018) works analyze four energy-balanced dietary patterns: flexitarian, pescatarian, vegetarian, and vegan; (de Gavelle et al., 2019) research explore four dietary types: omnivores, pro-flexitarians, flexitarians, vegetarians. (Soule & Sekhon, 2019) suggest six categories, according to environmental, health, animal welfare motivations, and outcomes of diets: omnivore conventional, human meat-eaters, flexitarian/reducitarian, pescatarian, vegetarian, and vegan.

De Backer and Hudders (2015) classified meat diet patterns into three categories: full-time meat-eaters, flexitarians, and vegetarians. Similarly, Apostolidis & McLeay (2019) identified three consumer groups: meat-eaters, meat reducers, and vegetarians. These three categories seem to cover the main categories of behavior related to meat consumption. The first category includes full-time meat-eaters without consumption reduction behavior. It is important to highlight that the meat-eaters category include consumers that adopt an efficient behavior strategy, purchasing more sustainable meat (Apostolidis & McLeay, 2019).

The second category comprises people who eat meat with consciously consumption reduction behavior. Still eat meat, but in less quantity and frequency, or eat just some kind of meat (e.g., fish or chicken and not red meat) (Apostolidis & McLeay, 2016; Rosenfeld et al., 2019). Comprise replacing meat with other proteins, such as plant-based products, insects, and mycoprotein (Apostolidis & McLeay, 2016). Finally, vegetarians are people who do not eat meat, including different levels of restriction on the consumption of food of animal origin (e.g., milk, eggs, honey) (De Backer & Hudders, 2015). Diets free of meat or with reduced consumption of the same have been linked to ethical, sustainable, beneficial to health and aligned with animal welfare (Soule & Sekhon, 2019).

Eating meat is the current standard and norm, and most consumers are in the meat eater's category. In Brazil, approximately 8% of the population calls itself vegetarian (Ibope, 2018), and other countries present a similar percentual around 10% of the population (Apostolidis & McLeay, 2019; Bryant, 2019). Flexitarians or meat reducers are a growing category: an increasing number of people who report the intention to reduce meat consumption or even stop eating it (Apostolidis & McLeay, 2019). Vandermoere et al. (2019) suggests that there is a "call" from society and academy for a sustainable food system, including eating less meat.



## 5. Future research questions

Previously, we discussed the conflict among the social norms of different groups using as theoretical lens social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and focused theory of normative conduct (Cialdini et al., 1990). We explored under what conditions the social norms of different groups can be divergent and what would be the possible influences on consumption behavior. Also, we presented the context of sustainable diets and food consumption, exploring meat consumption. Next, we propose research questions that may guide future studies.

Conflict among social norms of different groups is a possible situation and is yet little explored. Previously studies in Social Psychology suggest that normative conflict situations, individuals use cognitive activities and behavior as strategies to harmonize identities. However, it is not clear what the effect of incompatible normative standards in consumer behavior. Norms' conflict impact in behavior can be mixed, positive, or negative and are influenced by other factors (Fritsche et al., 2018; McDonald et al., 2014a). Thus, we propose that it is relevant to investigate the conflict of social norms of different groups and how this phenomenon influences consumer behavior. Considering the relevance of the focus theory of normative conduct (Cialdini et al., 1990), that the main question that arises from the theoretical gap identified is:

RQ1 – What is the effect of the conflict among social norms from different groups on consumer behavior?

RQ1.1: What is the role of group identification and norm salience on the conflict of social norms from different groups?

RQ1.2: Which moderator variables could be influencing the effect of the conflict of social norms on behavior?

In the food domain, conflict of norms among groups seems to be especially relevant. First, due to the relevance of the influence that social norms have on feeding behavior (Higgs & Thomas, 2016) and its effectiveness for shaping it (Rilling & Sanfey, 2011). Furthermore, they are indicated as significant predictors of changes in food consumption, including meat (Cheah et al., 2020; Eker et al., 2019).

Eating meat is the current social norm in most societies, including Brazil. Still, there is a crescent movement to changes in diet patterns related to meat intake, and it could affect the norms of some groups. People may be exposed to diverging social norms from different and relevant groups, especially in regions and societies that are culturally and economically connected with raising animals for slaughter and meat consumption. Therefore, in our understanding, it is outlined as an interesting field to explore the theoretical gap, raising the follow research questions:

RQ2: What is the context of meat consumption in Brazil?

RQ2.1: Vegetarians and meat reducers are growing groups of consumers in Brazil?

RQ2.2: The conflict among social norms from different groups on meat consumer behavior can be identified in Brazil context?

RQ3: What is the effect of the conflict among social norms from different groups on meat consumer behavior?

RQ3.1: Do the social norms of the family group related to meat consumption have a special influence on the effect of the conflict of social norms on meat consumption behavior?

Table 1 summarizes the research questions proposed.

Table 1

### Research questions

Dimension	Research questions
-----------	--------------------

Theory	RQ1: What is the effect of the conflict among social norms from different groups on consumer behavior? RQ1.1: What is the role of group identification and norm salience on the conflict of social norms from different groups? RQ1.2: Which moderator variables could be influencing the effect of the conflict of social norms on behavior?
Context of study	RQ2: What is the context of meat consumption in Brazil? RQ2.1: Vegetarians and meat reducers are growing groups of consumers in Brazil?
Theory applied to the study context	RQ3: The conflict among social norms from different groups on meat consumer behavior can be identified in Brazil context? RQ3.1: What is the effect of the conflict among social norms from different groups on meat consumer behavior? RQ3.2: Do the social norms of the family group related to meat consumption have a special influence on the effect of the conflict of social norms on meat consumption behavior?

## 6 Conclusion

The effect of norm-conflict situations has been discussed previously for situations of proenvironmental decisions and adherence to harmful norms. However, despite the relevance of social norms in human behavior and the importance of meat consumption in actual's society (research seeks to understand both its consumption and reduction), this is a topic little explored in the consumer behavior area. Considering, also, the growing proenvironmental movement and increased intention to reduce or to curtail of meat consumption for a reason linked to environmental, health and/or animal welfare concerns (Soule & Sekhon, 2019), it is suggested that this area of research has potential for theoretical and social contributions and managerial for the field of Marketing and Management. The impact of this conflict on meat-eating behavior is unknown, and this appears to be a flourishing field for study for consumer behavior.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). Social Identification, Self-Categorization and Social Influence. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *1*(1), 195–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779108401862>
- Abrams, D., Wetherell, M., Cochrane, S., Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1990). Knowing what to think by knowing who you are: Self-categorization and the nature of norm formation, conformity and group polarization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*(2), 97–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1990.tb00892.x>
- Amiot, C. E., De La Sablonnière, R., Terry, D. J., & Smith, J. R. (2007). Integration of social identities in the self: Toward a cognitive- developmental model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*(4), 364–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307304091>
- Amiot, C. E., Lizzio-Wilson, M., Thomas, E. F., & Louis, W. R. (2020). Bringing together humanistic and intergroup perspectives to build a model of internalisation of normative social harmdoing. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(3),

485–504. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2659>

- Apostolidis, C., & McLeay, F. (2016). Should we stop meating like this? Reducing meat consumption through substitution. *Food Policy*, *65*, 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.11.002>
- Apostolidis, C., & McLeay, F. (2019). To meat or not to meat? Comparing empowered meat consumers' and anti-consumers' preferences for sustainability labels. *Food Quality and Preference*, *77*(December 2018), 109–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2019.04.008>
- Bryant, C. J. (2019). We can't keep meating like this: Attitudes towards vegetarian and vegan diets in the United Kingdom. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *11*(23). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236844>
- Cheah, I., Sadat Shimul, A., Liang, J., & Phau, I. (2020). Drivers and barriers toward reducing meat consumption. *Appetite*, 104636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2020.104636>
- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: Recycling the Concept of Norms to Reduce Littering in Public Places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(6), 1015–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015>
- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 151–192). McGraw-Hill. Clayton,. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-07091-021>
- Coleman, N. V., Williams, P., & Morales, A. C. (2019). Identity threats, compensatory consumption, and working memory capacity: How feeling threatened leads to heightened evaluations of identity-relevant products. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *46*(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy060>
- Cooper, D., & Thatcher, S. (2010). Identification in organizations: The role of self-concept orientations and identification motives. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(4), 516–538. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.53502693>
- Cruwys, T., Bevelander, K. E., & Hermans, R. C. J. (2015). Social modeling of eating: A review of when and why social influence affects food intake and choice. *Appetite*, *86*, 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.08.035>
- De Backer, C. J. S., & Hudders, L. (2015). Meat morals: Relationship between meat consumption consumer attitudes towards human and animal welfare and moral behavior. *Meat Science*, *99*, 68–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.08.011>
- de Gavelle, E., Davidenko, O., Fouillet, H., Delarue, J., Darcel, N., Huneau, J. F., & Mariotti, F. (2019). Self-declared attitudes and beliefs regarding protein sources are a good prediction of the degree of transition to a low-meat diet in France. *Appetite*, *142*(June), 104345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104345>
- Dermody, J., Koenig-Lewis, N., Zhao, A. L., & Hanmer-Lloyd, S. (2018). Appraising the influence of pro-environmental self-identity on sustainable consumption buying and curtailment in emerging markets: Evidence from China and Poland. *Journal of Business Research*, *86*(September 2017), 333–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.09.041>

- Eker, S., Reese, G., & Obersteiner, M. (2019). Modelling the drivers of a widespread shift to sustainable diets. *Nature Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0331-1>
- FAO (2010). Definition of sustainable diets. International scientific symposium: Biodiversity and sustainable diets united against hunger. Rome (Italy): Food and Agriculture.
- Fritsche, I., Barth, M., Jugert, P., Masson, T., & Reese, G. (2018). A social identity model of pro-environmental action (SIMPEA). *Psychological Review*, *125*(2), 245–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000090>
- García-de-Frutos, N., Ortega-Egea, J. M., & Martínez-del-Río, J. (2018). Anti-consumption for Environmental Sustainability: Conceptualization, Review, and Multilevel Research Directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *148*(2), 411–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3023-z>
- Gibson, C. B., Dunlop, P. D., & Raghav, S. (2020). Navigating identities in global work: Antecedents and consequences of intrapersonal identity conflict. *Human Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719895314>
- Giguère, B., Lalonde, R., & Lou, E. (2010). Living at the Crossroads of Cultural Worlds: The Experience of Normative Conflicts by Second Generation Immigrant Youth. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*(1), 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00228.x>
- Goldstein, N. J., Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). A Room with a Viewpoint: Using Social Norms to Motivate Environmental Conservation in Hotels. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *35*(3), 472–482. <https://doi.org/10.1086/586910>
- Hamann, K. R. S., Reese, G., Seewald, D., & Loeschinger, D. C. (2015). Affixing the theory of normative conduct (to your mailbox): Injunctive and descriptive norms as predictors of anti-ads sticker use. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *44*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.08.003>
- Hawkins, R. X. D., Goodman, N. D., & Goldstone, R. L. (2019). The Emergence of Social Norms and Conventions. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *23*(2), 158–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2018.11.003>
- Higgs, S., Liu, J., Collins, E. I. M., & Thomas, J. M. (2019). Using social norms to encourage healthier eating. *Nutrition Bulletin*, *44*(1), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nbu.12371>
- Higgs, Suzanne. (2015). Social norms and their influence on eating behaviours. *Appetite*, *86*, 38–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.10.021>
- Higgs, Suzanne, & Thomas, J. (2016). Social influences on eating. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.10.005>
- Hirsh, J. B., & Kang, S. K. (2016). Mechanisms of Identity Conflict: Uncertainty, Anxiety, and the Behavioral Inhibition System. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *20*(3), 223–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868315589475>
- Hogg, M. A. (2016). Social Identity Theory. In S. McKeown et al. (eds.) (Ed.), *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory* (pp. 3–17). Peace Psychology Book Series. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29869-6>

- Ibope, I. B. de P. e E.-. (2018). *Pesquisa de opinião pública sobre veganismo* (Vol. 1, Issue 1).  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2010.07.003><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.080><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbapap.2013.06.007><https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02309/full><http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13762->
- Jones, A. D., Hoey, L., Blesh, J., Miller, L., Green, A., & Shapiro, L. F. (2016). A Systematic Review of the Measurement of Sustainable Diets. *Advances in Nutrition: An International Review Journal*, 7(4), 641–664.  
<https://doi.org/10.3945/an.115.011015>
- Kallgren, C. A., Reno, R. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). A focus theory of normative conduct: When norms do and do not affect behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(8), 1002–1012.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672002610009>
- Klöckner, C. A. (2017). A stage model as an analysis framework for studying voluntary change in food choices – The case of beef consumption reduction in Norway. *Appetite*, 108, 434–449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.11.002>
- Lapinski, M. K., & Rimal, R. N. (2005). An explication of social norms. *Communication Theory*, 15(2), 127–147. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/15.2.127>
- Lehner, M., Mont, O., & Heiskanen, E. (2016). Nudging – A promising tool for sustainable consumption behaviour? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 134, 166–177.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.11.086>
- Leroy, F., & Praet, I. (2015). Meat traditions. The co-evolution of humans and meat. *Appetite*, 90, 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.03.014>
- Macdiarmid, J. I., Douglas, F., & Campbell, J. (2016). Eating like there's no tomorrow: Public awareness of the environmental impact of food and reluctance to eat less meat as part of a sustainable diet. *Appetite*, 96(August 2019), 487–493.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.10.011>
- Machovina, B., Feeley, K. J., & Ripple, W. J. (2015). Biodiversity conservation: The key is reducing meat consumption. *Science of the Total Environment*, 536, 419–431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.07.022>
- Markowski, K. L., & Roxburgh, S. (2019). “If I became a vegan, my family and friends would hate me:” Anticipating vegan stigma as a barrier to plant-based diets. *Appetite*, 135(December 2018), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.12.040>
- McDonald, R. I., & Crandall, C. S. (2015). Social norms and social influence. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 147–151.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.04.006>
- McDonald, R. I., Fielding, K. S., & Louis, W. R. (2013). Energizing and De-Motivating Effects of Norm-Conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212464234>
- McDonald, R. I., Fielding, K. S., & Louis, W. R. (2014a). Conflicting Norms Highlight the Need for Action. *Environment and Behavior*, 46(2), 139–162.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916512453992>

- McDonald, R. I., Fielding, K. S., & Louis, W. R. (2014b). Conflicting social norms and community conservation compliance. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 22(3), 212–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2013.11.005>
- Miller, D. T., & Prentice, D. A. (2016). Changing Norms to Change Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67(1), 339–361. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015013>
- Milton, K. (1999). A hypothesis to explain the role of meat-eating in human evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 8(1), 11–21. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6505\(1999\)8:1<11::AID-EVAN6>3.0.CO;2-M](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6505(1999)8:1<11::AID-EVAN6>3.0.CO;2-M)
- Ministry of Health of Brazil. Dietary guidelines for the Brazilian population. Brasilia (Brazil): Ministry of Health of Brazil; 2014.
- Newell, B. R., McDonald, R. I., Brewer, M., & Hayes, B. K. (2014). The Psychology of Environmental Decisions. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 39(1), 443–467. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-010713-094623>
- Nolan, J. M., Schultz, P. W., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). Normative social influence is underdetected. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(7), 913–923. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208316691>
- Oyserman, D. (2009a). Identity-based motivation: Implications for action-readiness, procedural-readiness, and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(3), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.05.008>
- Oyserman, D. (2009b). Identity-based motivation and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(3), 276–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.06.001>
- Plows, S. E., Smith, F. D., Smith, J. R., Chapman, C. M., La Macchia, S. T., & Louis, W. R. (2017). Healthy eating: A beneficial role for perceived norm conflict? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(6), 295–304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12430>
- Reed, A., Forehand, M. R., Puntoni, S., & Warlop, L. (2012). Identity-based consumer behavior. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29(4), 310–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2012.08.002>
- Rilling, J. K., & Sanfey, A. G. (2011). The Neuroscience of Social Decision-Making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62(1), 23–48. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych.121208.131647>
- Robinson, E., Thomas, J., Aveyard, P., & Higgs, S. (2014). What everyone else is eating: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of informational eating norms on eating behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 114(3), 414–429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2013.11.009>
- Rosenfeld, D. L., Rothgerber, H., & Tomiyama, A. J. (2019). Mostly Vegetarian, But Flexible About It: Investigating How Meat-Reducers Express Social Identity Around Their Diets. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619869619>
- Rosenfeld, D. L., & Tomiyama, A. J. (2019). When vegetarians eat meat: Why vegetarians violate their diets and how they feel about doing so. *Appetite*, 143(April), 104417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104417>

- Rozin, P. (2005). The meaning of food in our lives: A cross-cultural perspective on eating and well-being. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 37(SUPPL. 2). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1499-4046\(06\)60209-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1499-4046(06)60209-1)
- Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2018). The Constructive, Destructive, and Reconstructive Power of Social Norms: Reprise. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(2), 249–254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617693325>
- Smith, J. R., & Louis, W. R. (2008). Do as we say and as we do: The interplay of descriptive and injunctive group norms in the attitude-behaviour relationship. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(4), 647–666. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466607X269748>
- Sobal, J., Bisogni, C. A., & Jastran, M. (2014). Food Choice Is Multifaceted, Contextual, Dynamic, Multilevel, Integrated, and Diverse. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 8(1), 6–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mbe.12044>
- Soule, C. A. A., & Sekhon, T. (2019). Preaching to the middle of the road: Strategic differences in persuasive appeals for meat anti-consumption. *British Food Journal*, 121(1), 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2018-0209>
- Springmann, M., Wiebe, K., Mason-D’Croz, D., Sulser, T. B., Rayner, M., & Scarborough, P. (2018). Health and nutritional aspects of sustainable diet strategies and their association with environmental impacts: a global modelling analysis with country-level detail. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 2(10), e451–e461. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(18\)30206-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30206-7)
- Stok, F. M., de Vet, E., de Ridder, D. T. D., & de Wit, J. B. F. (2016). The potential of peer social norms to shape food intake in adolescents and young adults: a systematic review of effects and moderators. *Health Psychology Review*, 10(3), 326–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2016.1155161>
- Stok, F. M., Mollen, S., Verkooijen, K. T., & Renner, B. (2018). Unravelling social norm effects: How and when social norms affect eating behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(May), 783. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00738>
- Stoll-Kleemann, S., & Schmidt, U. J. (2017). Reducing meat consumption in developed and transition countries to counter climate change and biodiversity loss: a review of influence factors. *Regional Environmental Change*, 17(5), 1261–1277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-016-1057-5>
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2010). The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory. *Social Psychology*, 63(4), 284–297.
- Swann Jr., W. B. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In *Psychological Perspectives on the Self* (Issue June, pp. 33–66). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.218.4574.782>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroups relations* (pp. 33–48). Brokks/Cole.
- Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: Self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 225–244.

- The Lancet. (2018). We need to talk about meat. *The Lancet*, 392(10161), 2237. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32971-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32971-4)
- Thøgersen, J. (2006). Norms for environmentally responsible behaviour: An extended taxonomy. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 26(4), 247–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.09.004>
- Vandermoere, F., Geerts, R., De Backer, C., Erreygers, S., & Van Doorslaer, E. (2019). Meat consumption and vegaphobia: An exploration of the characteristics of meat eaters, vegaphobes, and their social environment. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(14). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11143936>
- Verain, M. C. D., Dagevos, H., & Antonides, G. (2015). Sustainable food consumption: Product choice or curtailment? *Appetite*, 91, 375–384. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.04.055>
- Vermeir, I., & Verbeke, W. (2006). Sustainable food consumption: Exploring the consumer “attitude - Behavioral intention” gap. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 19(2), 169–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-005-5485-3>
- Vermeir, I., Weijters, B., Houwer, J. De, Geuens, M., Slabbinck, H., Spruyt, A., Kerckhove, A. Van, Lippevelde, W. Van, & Steur, H. De. (2020). *Environmentally Sustainable Food Consumption : A Review and Research Agenda From a Goal-Directed Perspective*. 11(July), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01603>
- Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., Garnett, T., Tilman, D., DeClerck, F., Wood, A., Jonell, M., Clark, M., Gordon, L. J., Fanzo, J., Hawkes, C., Zurayk, R., Rivera, J. A., De Vries, W., Majele Sibanda, L., ... Murray, C. J. L. (2019). Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. In *The Lancet* (Vol. 393, Issue 10170). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31788-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4)
- Willits-Smith, A., Aranda, R., Heller, M. C., & Rose, D. (2020). Addressing the carbon footprint, healthfulness, and costs of self-selected diets in the USA: a population-based cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 4(3), e98–e106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(20\)30055-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30055-3)
- Wright, B., & Bragge, P. (2018). Interventions to promote healthy eating choices when dining out: A systematic review of reviews. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 23(2), 278–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12285>
- Yamin, P., Fei, M., Lahlou, S., & Levy, S. (2019). Using social norms to change behavior and increase sustainability in the real world: A systematic review of the literature. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(20). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11205847>