Table SB5 LPM estimation results of policy acceptability by policy – control group only.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pooled | | France | | Italy | | Latvia | |
|  | Policy acceptability for oneself | Policy acceptability for society | Policy acceptability for oneself | Policy acceptability for society | Policy acceptability for oneself | Policy acceptability for society | Policy acceptability for oneself | Policy acceptability for society |
| *Meat tax (vs. Meat-free day)* | -0.493\*\*\* 0.018 | -0.462\*\*\* 0.018 | -0.541\*\*\* 0.030 | -0.508\*\*\* 0.030 | -0.476\*\*\* 0.031 | -0.476\*\*\* 0.031 | -0.450\*\*\* 0.036 | -0.381\*\*\* 0.034 |
| *France (vs. Italy)* | -0.073\*\* 0.022 | -0.021 0.022 | 0.746\*\*\* 0.022 | 0.664\*\*\* 0.024 | 0.640\*\*\* 0.024 | 0.627\*\*\* 0.025 | 0.602\*\*\* 0.029 | 0.464\*\*\* 0.029 |
| *Latvia (vs. Italy)* | -0.098\*\*\* 0.023 | -0.137\*\*\* 0.023 | . . | . . | . . | . . | . . | . . |
| Constant | 0.722\*\*\* 0.018 | 0.641\*\*\* 0.019 | . . | . . | . . | . . | . . | . . |
| N | 2136 | 2136 | 780 | 780 | 778 | 778 | 578 | 578 |
| R² | .256 | 0.244 | 0.293 | 0.266 | 0.235 | 0.238 | 0.215 | 0.182 |
| R²adj | 0.255 | 0.243 | 0.292 | 0.265 | 0.234 | 0.237 | 0.214 | 0.181 |
| Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. P-values based on robust standard errors, with \*\*\*p<0.001, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05. | | | | | | | | |

Table SB6 Percentage of respondents who consider the meat reduction policies acceptable by eat in canteen, and by policy, and country.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | France | | Italy | | Latvia | |
|  | Does not eat in canteen | Eats in canteen | Does not eat in canteen | Eats in canteen | Does not eat in canteen | Eats in canteen |
| Meat Tax | 15.5% | 15.4% | 22.4% | 26.8% | 12.5% | 13.4% |
| Meat-free Day | 65.4% | 68% | 72.3% | 75% | 61.8% | 64.5% |
| N | 613 | 169 | 643 | 168 | 144 | 417 |
| T-test of difference in means between does not eat in canteen and eats in canteen; \*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05, \*\*\*p<0.01. | | | | | | |

Table SB7. LPM estimation results of policy acceptability by perspective - all samples.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pooled | | France | | Italy | | Latvia | |
|  | Meat tax acceptability | Meat-free day acceptability | Meat tax acceptability | Meat-free day acceptability | Meat tax acceptability | Meat-free day acceptability | Meat tax acceptability | Meat-free day acceptability |
| *Health-risk information* | 0.041\*\* (0.016) | 0.072\*\*\* (0.021) | 0.049 0.028 | 0.082\* 0.033 | 0.013 0.026 | 0.013 0.035 | 0.069\* 0.027 | 0.138\*\* 0.041 |
| *Acceptability for oneself (vs. for society)* | 0.011 (0.015) | 0.041\* (0.021) | 0.038 0.027 | 0.008 0.033 | -0.017 0.025 | 0.032 0.034 | 0.013 0.024 | 0.099\* 0.042 |
| *Health-risk information # Acceptability for oneself (vs. for society)* | -0.009 (0.022) | -0.021 (0.029) | 0.015 0.040 | -0.042 0.046 | -0.003 0.036 | 0.008 0.048 | -0.054 0.037 | -0.024 0.059 |
| *France (vs. Italy)* | -0.056\*\*\* (0.013) | -0.046\*\* (0.017) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Latvia (vs. Italy)* | -0.094\*\*\* (0.014) | -0.123\*\*\* (0.019) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.180\*\*\* (0.013) | 0.647\*\*\* (0.017) | 0.156\*\*\* 0.018 | 0.664\*\*\* 0.024 | 0.152\*\*\* 0.018 | 0.627\*\*\* 0.025 | 0.083\*\*\* 0.016 | 0.464\*\*\* 0.029 |
| N | 4308 | 4308 | 1622 | 1622 | 1564 | 1564 | 1122 | 1122 |
| R² | .013 | 0.016 | 0.008 | 0.005 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.007 | 0.024 |
| R²adj | 0.012 | 0.015 | 0.006 | 0.003 | -0.001 | -0.000 | 0.004 | 0.022 |
| Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. P-values based on robust standard errors, with \*\*\*p<0.001, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05. | | | | | | | | |