Report: Is One Message or Multiple Messages More Effective For Inspiring People To Reduce Meat Consumption?

Sabine Doebel, Susan Gabriel, and The Humane League

Humane League Labs

September 2014

www.HumaneLeagueLabs.com
www.TheHumaneLeague.com
Goal

The goal of this study was to assess whether presenting a single, focused message about why one should go vegetarian is more or less effective than presenting multiple messages in inspiring people to reduce or cease consumption of animal products. For example, is a single message about the health benefits of going vegetarian more compelling than multiple messages focused on health, animal cruelty, and the environment? Intuitively, one might think that providing a range of compelling reasons should be more persuasive than just one reason, both for a single individual and across individuals with different concerns; on the other hand, a focused message might be easier to process and digest. This study aims to clarify this question so vegan advocates can design materials that are most likely to inspire people to change their diet.

Methodology

Each respondent in the study was randomly presented with 1 of 4 images of a pamphlet page providing reasons for going vegetarian, and were then asked a series of questions to assess their intentions to change their diet. Each page differed in the content and number of messages presented. Pages A and B each focused on a single message. Page A presented information about the animal cruelty inherent in a meat-based diet, focusing specifically on the conditions of pigs raised and killed for meat on factory farms. Page B presented information about the health benefits of going vegetarian. Page C presented both the animal cruelty and health messages as well as a third message about the environmental benefits of giving up meat. Page D included both the health and animal cruelty messages. Pictures of the booklet pages are presented below.

Intention to change was assessed via 3 key dependent variables:
1) General intention to change eating behavior
2) Specific intentions to reduce consumption of specific meat and dairy products
3) Interest in learning more about how to go vegetarian as indexed by commitment to receive a vegetarian starter guide.

Analysis

We report our findings for each of our questions in two stages, presenting the results for the full sample first, followed by the results for respondents aged 24 years and younger.

How Do One Versus Many Messages Affect General Intentions to Change Eating Behavior? (Full Sample)
To assess general intention to change eating behavior after viewing 1 of the 4 pamphlet pages, respondents were asked: “Based on the information you just read, would you be likely to change the way you eat?” Responses were either yes or no. Overall, 42.7% of respondents (347 out of 798) indicated a general intention to change their eating behavior upon viewing the booklet pages. Intention to change varied by pamphlet page:

- Page A: 52.3% (103 out of 197)
- Page B: 33.7% (62 out of 184)
- Page C: 46% (98 out of 213)
- Page D: 41% (84 out of 204)

Caution is needed in interpreting differences between these percentages, which may not be statistically significant (i.e., are likely due to chance). We conducted analyses using the Chi Square statistic to determine which differences were indeed significant (unlikely to be due to chance).

Page A was far more effective at generating intention to change than page B, $X^2(1, N = 546) = 5.34, p = .02$. The difference between pages A and C was not statistically significant, $X^2(1, N = 410) = 1.61, p = .20$. However, the difference between A and D was, with A being more likely to generate intentions to change than D, $X^2(1, N = 401) = 4.97, p = .03$.

Respondents were significantly more likely to indicate an intention to change when shown page C versus page B, $X^2(1, N = 397) = 6.22, p = .013$. However, there was no significant difference between pages B and D, $X^2(1, N = 508) = 0.56, p = .45$.

The finding that page A was more effective in generating intention to change than page D and page B but not page C is not consistent with a straightforward pattern that more messages reduce impact. Instead, it may be that the content is what matters most: D presents the health message and animal cruelty message together as if on equal footing, and it is possible that this is not appealing. The message ‘a better you without the cruelty’ may feel dissonant and could turn people off. On the other hand, the presentation of one messages together (cruelty, health, and environment) may not have the same implication as the juxtaposition of the cruelty and health messages.

The finding that page C was more effective at generating intention to change than B is possibly because the health message was not perceived as compelling by some, and adding other messages broadened appeal.

**How Do One Versus Many Messages Affect General Intention to Change Eating Behavior? (Respondents 24 Years of Age and Younger)**

The percentage of respondents indicating a general intention to change their eating behaviors over the next month broken down by which pamphlet page they viewed are as follows. Note that because the sample sizes here are even smaller than in the general population, the data is significantly less reliable.

- Page A: 48.1% (37 out of 77)
- Page B: 22.9% (16 out of 70)
- Page C: 50.5% (47 out of 93)
- Page D: 38.5% (35 out of 91)
The data suggests that younger people are less responsive to the health message than older people (compare to data for the full sample, which indicates a higher percentage for page B), which likely reflects the fact that younger people are generally less concerned about their health than older people.

Pages A versus C were comparably effective in the younger group, with no significant difference found, \( \chi^2(1, N = 170) = .104, p = .74 \). The difference between Pages A and D also failed to reach statistical significance, \( \chi^2(1, N = 168) = 1.57, p = .21 \).

When a single message focuses on health (page B), one message is much worse than three at generating intentions to change the younger group, \( \chi^2(1, N = 163) = 12.91, p < .001 \). It is also worse than two messages, \( \chi^2(1, N = 161) = 4.45, p < .05 \).

These findings suggest that for young people, the effectiveness of a single message versus multiple messages depends on what that single message is and whether it resonates. The animal cruelty message alone is equally as powerful as that message combined with one or two other messages, while the health message alone is less powerful than when it is combined with one or two other messages that are more likely to resonate.

The take home here is that multiple messages can be effective insofar as it can interest a greater number of individuals with divergent concerns, but careful consideration needs to be given to how these messages are presented (avoiding juxtaposing messages in a certain way that can turn off a reader) and which messages are included (with consideration of the target demographic).

**How Do One Versus Many Messages Affect Intentions to Reduce Consumption of Specific Animal Products? (Full Sample and Respondents 24 Years of Age and Younger)**

Respondents were then asked about their specific intentions to change their consumption of 5 categories of animal products: red meat (beef and pork), poultry, fish, eggs, and dairy. For example, participants were asked to “think about your red meat (beef and pork) consumption. Given the information you have just read, in the next month do you think you will: eat more meat, eat the same amount of meat, eat a little less meat, eat a lot less meat, or stop eating meat?” Respondents were also given the option to indicate that they already do not eat a given animal product.

Graphs summarizing the average responses to each of these questions are presented below, both for the full sample and only respondents 24 years of age.

Next, we computed a single value representing the net benefit to animals corresponding to respondents’ intention to change their eating habits across the 5 questions about each category of animal product. Given background knowledge about how much meat, eggs, and dairy the average American eats per year, we can make informed estimates of the number of days of farm animal suffering prevented by a given % reduction in consumption. For example, the average American eats enough chicken to cause approximately 1220 days of suffering (as measured by the number of chickens eaten per year times the number of days each chicken lives on a factory farm). If an individual expresses an intention to reduce their chicken consumption by 10%, then we can extrapolate that this will spare about 122 days of animal suffering per year.

Days of suffering experienced by animals per year are estimated as follows:

- Farm-Raised Fish: 1500
- Chicken: 1220
- Eggs: 365
Red Meat: 113
Dairy: 12

The percentage change estimated for each response option to the questions respondents answered is as follows:

- Eat more of a given animal product = 20% more
- Eat the same = 0 change
- Eat a little less = 10% less
- Eat a lot less = 35% less
- Stop eating entirely = 100% less
- I already don’t eat this = 0 change

To complete our analyses, average days of suffering spared for each category (red meat, poultry, fish, eggs, and dairy) and overall were computed. These results are depicted in the table below.

For the full sample, overall number of days of suffering spared was highest for page D followed by C, then B, although all three pages fell in the same general range. Page A spared the fewest days of suffering. Only the difference between pages A and D was statistically significant, with A sparing significantly fewer days of suffering than D, t(399) = 2.26, p = .024. The difference between C and A was trending towards significance, with C being more effective at reducing days of suffering than A, t(408) = 1.89, p = .06. Correcting for multiple comparisons, only the difference between A and D is reliable. For animal protection advocates this means that, given the choice, page D, with its two messages focused on cruelty and health, is a reliably better choice than page A if the goal is to reduce the greatest number of days of suffering across animal categories. It is not clear, on the other hand, whether D is actually more likely to reduce suffering than B or C, since the differences between these pages were not significant and therefore could have been due to chance.

The table suggests that these patterns might be because people who viewed page A mainly focused on reducing consumption of red meat and poultry, and planned to increase consumption of fish. By contrast, people who viewed pages B, C, and D, planned to significantly reduce fish consumption, and people who viewed pages C and D planned to make large changes across all product categories. People who viewed page B, which focused solely on the health message, planned to reduce chicken consumption at a slightly lower rate than the other groups, likely because chicken is viewed as a relatively healthy meat to eat.

Among those 24 years of age and younger, Pages C and D generated the greatest reduction in days of animal suffering, with Pages B and A trailing significantly behind. Page C spared significantly more days of animal suffering than page A, t(161) = 2.43, p = .016. Page D was trending towards sparing more days of suffering than A, but this difference was not significant, t(166) = 1.73, p = .086. Page C was marginally significant in sparing more days of suffering than B, t(161) = 1.91, p = .057. Again, correcting for multiple comparisons, only the difference between A and C is reliable. Thus, for those 24 and younger, combining the cruelty, health, and environmental messages was more effective than focusing on one message, whether cruelty or health. It is possible that even two messages (health and cruelty) is better than one, but the differences were not significant and thus could have been due to chance.

Page B generated lower reductions in fish and chicken consumption than Pages C and D, and Page A once again generated an increase in fish consumption.

An additional difference worth noting between the full set of respondents and those 24 and younger is the difference between Pages C and D. Among all respondents, a focus on just health and animals appeared to work slightly better, whereas among respondents 24 and younger, including
the environmental message seemed to work slightly better; however the differences between Pages C and D are small enough that they are most likely due to chance and not an actual difference in impact between the two. Nevertheless these differences do correspond with the results of the first question around general intention to change, and as we will see they also correspond with the third question on receiving a vegetarian starter guide. Taken together these differences suggest that the environmental reasons to reduce meat consumption might be more compelling to those 24 and under than they are to older individuals.

Among both young respondents and respondents as a whole, it does appear that having multiple reasons to reduce consumption of animal products may lead people to want to make more widespread reductions across all animal product categories, rather than making heavier changes to specific products.

One other important fact to be aware is that in this experiment, respondents were only presented with one page of information about why to change their diet. For Page B, the page focused on health, the reader did have their attention specifically drawn to chicken, fish, and eggs – the products which cause the greatest number of days of farmed animal suffering. The same holds for Pages C and D. However for Page A, the page focused just on animal cruelty, the page only discussed the treatment of pigs. In real life, most animal cruelty-focused materials discuss not just the cruelties done to pigs, but also the cruelties done to cows and chickens, and sometimes the cruelties done to fish.

It is quite possible therefore that in real-life vegan advocacy material that is focused purely on animal cruelty, but that covers the cruelty done to chickens and fish, the results seen below would not hold true. It is possible and seems like that, if the viewer is also informed about the cruelties done to chickens and fish, it will increase their interest in reducing their consumption of chicken, eggs, and fish. This could lead to cruelty-focused material being as effective as, or even more effective than, other approaches in terms of total days of suffering spared. Further study is needed to find out whether that is the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pamphlet page</th>
<th>Red meat</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Eggs</th>
<th>Dairy</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.97 (25.13)</td>
<td>88.87 (216.76)</td>
<td>-17.51 (173.19)</td>
<td>6.11 (41.51)</td>
<td>0.26 (1.24)</td>
<td>92 (333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.00 (14.39)</td>
<td>65.31 (159.94)</td>
<td>50.54 (205.39)</td>
<td>15.77 (59.66)</td>
<td>0.31 (1.39)</td>
<td>139 (356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11.88 (22.46)</td>
<td>85.92 (186.21)</td>
<td>40.14 (182.76)</td>
<td>15.94 (46.75)</td>
<td>0.39 (1.07)</td>
<td>154 (336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11.38 (22.82)</td>
<td>98.68 (242.20)</td>
<td>44.85 (221.15)</td>
<td>22.90 (60.20)</td>
<td>0.35 (1.27)</td>
<td>178 (423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24 Years of Age and Younger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11.15 (24.35)</td>
<td>53.87 (193.65)</td>
<td>-26.29 (125.12)</td>
<td>6.64 (33.61)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.83)</td>
<td>45 (280.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.70 (16.70)</td>
<td>27.89 (124.06)</td>
<td>19.29 (160.34)</td>
<td>9.64 (67.84)</td>
<td>0.39 (1.77)</td>
<td>64 (383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.94 (25.22)</td>
<td>90.52 (212.76)</td>
<td>41.12 (150.21)</td>
<td>10.01 (35.34)</td>
<td>0.37 (0.85)</td>
<td>155 (302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9.12 (20.71)</td>
<td>83.13 (248.12)</td>
<td>32.96 (217.14)</td>
<td>16.04 (56.86)</td>
<td>0.20 (1.11)</td>
<td>141 (413)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Do One Versus Many Messages Affect Interest in Receiving a Vegetarian Starter Guide? (Full Sample)

Lastly, as a more conservative and potentially more meaningful assessment of intention to change eating behavior in the form of reducing or cutting out meat/dairy consumption, respondents were asked whether they would be interested in receiving a vegetarian starter guide electronically via email, and if yes, to provide their email address. This was meant to help us assess not just whether someone said they planned to change (as gauged by questions 1 and 2), but also whether they were motivated enough to take a concrete step toward making a change. That is, we presume that if someone is willing to give over his or her email address to receive a vegetarian starter guide, it represents some sort of genuine interest in moving toward vegetarian eating.

The percentage of respondents who indicated they would like to receive a vegetarian starter guide, and who provided their email address, is as follows:

- Page A: 21.3% (42 out of 197)
- Page B: 15.8% (29 out of 184)
- Page C: 17.8% (38 out of 213)
- Page D: 22.1% (45 out of 204)

Statistical analyses indicate that, for the overall sample, the differences between page A and C, and A and D were not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 410) = 0.78, p = .37$, and $\chi^2(1, N = 402) = 0.04, p = .83$, respectively. The differences between pages B and C, and B and D were also not significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 397) = 0.30, p = .58$, and $\chi^2(1, N = 433) = 0.39, p = .52$, respectively. Thus, these pages did not differ at all in their effectiveness in motivating respondents to take a specific action step toward vegetarian eating.

How Do One Versus Many Messages Affect Interest in Receiving a Vegetarian Starter Guide? (Ages 24 Years and Younger)

The percentage of respondents aged 24 and younger who indicated they would like to receive a vegetarian starter guide, and who provided their email address, is as follows:

- Page A: 20.8% (16 out of 77)
- Page B: 8.6% (6 out of 70)
- Page C: 16.1% (15 out of 93)
- Page D: 14.3% (13 out of 91)

This analysis confirmed that younger people are less responsive to the health message; the animal cruelty message was significantly more effective than the health message in generating genuine intentions to change eating habits, $\chi^2(1, N = 147) = 4.29, p = .03$. However, a conservative interpretation of this difference is that it could be due to chance; once corrected for multiple comparisons, the difference does not meet the threshold for significance (i.e., $p = .05/5 = .01$).
In this younger age group, page A was not significantly more effective at generating genuine interest in change than page C: $X^2(1, N = 170) = .61$, $p = .43$. Nor was it significantly more effective than page D, $X^2(1, N = 168) = 1.23$, $p = .26$.

Page B was appeared marginally less effective than C and D, but neither of these differences was significant, page B versus C: $X^2(1, N = 163) = 2.03$, $p = .15$ and page B versus D: $X^2(1, N = 161) = 1.24$, $p = .27$.

Therefore, as with the overall sample, there was no pattern to suggest that one versus many messages differed in their effectiveness at generating specific intentions to change eating habits.

**Summary Of Analysis**

*Effect of one versus many messages on general intention to change*

In both the full sample and the younger sample, Page A was better than Page D but not better than Page C, consistent with the idea that the number of messages was not the critical factor here but rather the content. Page D brings together the health and cruelty message, which may not be appealing to some, and the lack of an environmental message may reduce the page’s impact among younger readers. The health message (Page B) was less compelling than the cruelty message for the full sample, and even more so for the subset of younger respondents.

*Effect of one versus many messages on days of suffering prevented*

The evidence suggests that presenting several messages (Page C and Page D) is similarly effective to or only slightly more effective than focusing solely on the health message (Page B). It also suggests that presenting several messages is much more effective than focusing on just the animal cruelty done toward a “red meat” species (Page A), because the latter appears to have the unintended effect of increasing animal product consumption in some categories (namely, fish). It is unknown how a brochure focused just on animal cruelty, but which covers pigs, cows, chickens, and fish, would fare against a brochure that focused equally on multiple messages on why to change.

This general trend held true for both the full sample and the younger group, although the younger group appears to respond slightly better when an environmental message is included and is even less responsive than the general public to a health-only message.

*Effect of one vs. many messages on intention to order a vegetarian starter guide*

In the general population there were no significant differences found in the rates at which viewers of each message ordered a vegetarian starter guide, although the animal cruelty message and the animal cruelty and health combination message appear to be marginally more effective for the general population and the animal cruelty message appears marginally more effective among those 24 and under. In both groups, the health message on its own appears to be the least effective, although this difference only reached statistical significance among younger viewers.
Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that when it comes to promoting the reduction or elimination of animal products, the question of whether to use one message or multiple messages is less important than the specific messages that are used.

In the context of a short message presentation (such as a one page leaflet), focusing just on the health reasons to eat vegan appears to be less effective for a general audience than focusing on multiple reasons to eat vegan.

Focusing on the single message of animal cruelty produced a large intention to change diet in some way, and appeared to be a good approach for inspiring people to take a specific action step toward change (by ordering a vegetarian starter guide). However focusing just on “red meat” species appears to do far less good for animals than using multiple messages on why to change, because in the former case respondents offset some of their reductions in red meat and poultry consumption with an increase in fish consumption. In other words, while they may be slightly more likely to change their diet, they do far less good for animals with the changes they make. It is unknown what the impact of focusing on animal cruelty and covering all animals (including chickens, egg-laying hens, and fish) would be relative to using multiple messages.

When we compare using a combination animal-health messaging against the trio of animal-health-environment message, the former appears to work slightly better for the population overall but the latter works slightly better for those aged 24 and young. However the differences between the combination message and the trio message are small for both audiences, and too small to reach statistical significance.

Overall, using multiple messages appears to be the best approach for the time being. For short materials targeting a general audience, this study suggests a combination of animal cruelty and health messaging may inspire the most positive change and help the greatest number of animals. (In an separate study, we found that when both animal cruelty and health messaging are used in pro-vegetarian booklets, focusing more page space on animal cruelty than on the health benefits of vegan eating may help more animals than the other way around:
http://humaneleaguelabs.wordpress.com/2014/05/20/report-what-elements-make-a-leaflet-more-effective/). For materials that target an audience aged 24 and under, including the environmental message as well may boost impact even further.

Future testing may find that focusing just on the animal cruelty message may help the greatest number of animals if the cruelties done to chickens and fish are also discussed. However, until future testing actually suggests that is the case, focusing just on animal cruelty appears to be risky. This study suggests that hedging our bets by focusing on both animals and health (and, for young audiences, on the environment as well) seems the safer and more demonstrably effective approach at this point.
Are You Against This Cruelty?

“They lie covered in their own urine and excrement, with broken legs from trying to escape or just to turn, covered with festering sores, tumors, ulcers, lesions.”

-MATTHEW SCULLY, Speechwriter for President George W. Bush

Pigs are kept indoors for their entire lives on concrete floors with no bedding. Female pigs are locked in cages so small they can’t even turn around for months at a time. Because pigs are very smart (smarter than cats and dogs), this causes severe mental problems. Some will repeatedly bite their cage bars; others become depressed and lie on the ground without moving.

When they are six months old, pigs are electrocuted or shot in the head with a “captive bolt gun.” (A gun that shoots a metal rod into the pig’s brain.) Pigs that don’t die right away are drowned alive in boiling water.

Percentage of respondents expressing intention to change the way they eat upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 52.3%
24 years and younger: 48.1%

Percentage of respondents who provided email address to receive vegetarian starter kit upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 21.3%
24 years and younger: 20.8%

Number of days of animal suffering spared as a result of respondents viewing this page:
Full sample: 93
24 years and younger: 45
Replacing meat with something better doesn’t mean changing what you believe. It just means putting your beliefs into action – for a better you and a better world.

Meats like chicken and fish are linked to many health problems. Chicken and eggs are two of the biggest sources of saturated fat intake. That’s one reason they are linked to higher death rates from breast cancer. Chicken and fish have high levels of cancer-causing chemicals such as dioxin, arsenic, and mercury.

According to the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, people who replace meat with something better have:
- lower body weight
- less heart disease
- less cancer
- lower cholesterol
- lower blood pressure
- lower rates of type 2 diabetes

Percentage of respondents expressing intention to change the way they eat upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 33.7%
24 years and younger: 22.9%

Percentage of respondents who provided email address to receive vegetarian starter kit upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 15.8%
24 years and younger: 8.6%

Number of days of animal suffering spared as a result of respondents viewing this page:
Full sample: 139
24 years and younger: 64
Bad For Animals, Your Health, And The Earth

Meats like chicken and fish are linked to many health problems. Chicken and eggs are two of the biggest sources of saturated fat intake. That’s one reason they are linked to higher death rates from breast cancer. Chicken and fish have high levels of cancer-causing chemicals such as dioxin, arsenic, and mercury.

Pigs are kept indoors for their entire lives on concrete floors with no bedding. Female pigs are locked in cages so small they can’t even turn around for months at a time. Because pigs are very smart (smarter than cats and dogs), this causes severe mental problems. Some will repeatedly bite their cage bars; others become depressed and lie on the ground without moving.

Animal farms are the biggest source of water pollution in the United States. Over 60% of streams and rivers are now contaminated with factory farm runoff. Animal farms are also a leading cause of climate change. They generate more greenhouse gas emissions than all of the cars, planes, and other forms of transportation combined.

Percentage of respondents expressing intention to change the way they eat upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 46%
24 years and younger: 50.5%

Percentage of respondents who provided email address to receive vegetarian starter kit upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 17.8%
24 years and younger: 16.1%

Number of days of animal suffering spared as a result of respondents viewing this page:
Full sample: 154
24 years and younger: 155
A Better You - Without The Cruelty

Replacing meat with something better doesn’t mean changing what you believe. It just means putting your beliefs into action – for a better you and a better world.

Meats like chicken and fish are linked to many health problems. Chicken and eggs are two of the biggest sources of saturated fat intake. That’s one reason they are linked to higher death rates from breast cancer. Chicken and fish have high levels of cancer-causing chemicals such as dioxin, arsenic, and mercury.

Pigs are kept indoors for their entire lives on concrete floors with no bedding. Female pigs are locked in cages so small they can’t even turn around for months at a time. Because pigs are very smart (smarter than cats and dogs), this causes severe mental problems. Some will repeatedly bite their cage bars; others become depressed and lie on the ground without moving. When they are six months old, pigs are electrocuted, shot in the head with a “captive bolt gun.” (A gun that shoots a metal rod into the pig’s brain.)

Percentage of respondents expressing intention to change the way they eat upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 41%
24 years and younger: 38.5%

Percentage of respondents who provided email address to receive vegetarian starter kit upon viewing this page:
Full sample: 22.1%
24 years and younger: 14.3%

Number of days of animal suffering spared as a result of respondents viewing this page:
Full sample: 178
24 years and younger: 141
• Most effective at generating specific action step toward change

• Least effective at reducing number of days of suffering animals experience

• Highly effective message for reducing number of days of suffering for full sample (and most effective for respondents 24 and younger)

• Moderately effective at generating specific action steps toward change, especially in younger individuals

• Less effective at reducing number of days of suffering animals experience

• Least effective at generating action step toward change

• Most effective at reducing number of days of suffering animals experience

• Moderately effective at generating specific action steps toward change