Drawing on neuroscientific findings, explain how you would develop and market a laboratory-grown meat.

K23003985

10. October 2023

1 Introduction

The production of conventional meat from animal agriculture has raised significant concerns related to environmental sustainability, climate change, and animal welfare. Livestock production is estimated to be responsible for approximately 15% of global greenhouse gas emissions, requiring large amounts of land, water and feed crops (Tuomisto & Teixeira de Mattos, 2011). Additionally, practices in industrial animal farming such as close confinement in crates and cages, painful mutilations like dehorning, and selective breeding for accelerated growth have faced ethical criticisms regarding infringement of animal rights and natural behaviors (Stephens et al., 2018). As global meat consumption continues to rise, there is an urgent need for more sustainable and ethical alternatives to conventional meat production.

Laboratory-grown or cultured meat offers a promising solution to address these issues associated with industrial animal agriculture. Also referred to as clean meat or in vitro meat, it involves growing animal cells in a culture medium rich in nutrients, encouraging the cells to proliferate and differentiate into muscle and fat tissues (Datar & Betti, 2010). This emerging technology enables meat production without the need for animal slaughter and with substantially lower greenhouse gas emissions, land and water use compared to conventional methods (Tuomisto & Teixeira de Mattos, 2011). However, reducing production costs through optimizing bioreactor design and cell culture media formulation remains a key barrier to commercialization (Specht et al., 2018).

Consumer research indicates that concerns about environmental sustainability and animal welfare could motivate the purchase of lab-grown meat as an alternative to traditional meat (Circus & Robison, 2018). However, public perceptions and reactions to this novel food technology are still largely unknown and warrant further investigation (Verbeke et al., 2015). Consumers may harbor concerns regarding the safety, taste, price and perceived naturalness of lab-grown meat (Bryant & Barnett, 2018). Neuromarketing techniques provide valuable insights into consumer decision-making and emotional responses that can help address these uncertainties. A deeper understanding

of the motivations, preferences and attitudes of consumers will be key to the successful development and marketing of lab-grown meat products.

This essay will provide an overview of the role of neuroscientific findings in developing and marketing lab-grown meat. Topics covered will include consumer perceptions, applications of neuromarketing, strategies for product development, and potential marketing approaches to introduce this sustainable protein alternative. A multidisciplinary perspective will be taken, drawing on research from food science, tissue engineering, consumer psychology and neuroscience.

2 Developing Lab-Grown Meat

Several key factors need to be considered in developing high-quality lab-grown meat products that can successfully replace conventional meat.

Texture and mouthfeel are important attributes, with consumers expecting a comparable experience to cooked animal meat (Datar & Betti, 2010). Culturing techniques that promote muscle fiber alignment and the formation of connective tissue can help achieve the texture profile of whole-cut meats like steak (Post, 2012). For ground products like burgers, smaller tissue spheroids or microcarriers can be used (Specht et al., 2018).

Flavor compounds produced during the cooking process also affect taste and should be matched to traditional meat through the use of ingredients like heme to catalyze reactions like Maillard browning (Post, 2012). Feed inputs during the cell culture process can allow flavors from fat and amino acids to develop (Kumar et al., 2021).

Ensuring adequate nutritional quality is also critical. Fortification of culture medium with iron, zinc, vitamin B12 and other micronutrients found in meat can optimize the nutritional composition of cultured meat (Fraeye et al., 2020). Health claims related to potential benefits like reduced saturated fats may add appeal for some consumers but require scientific substantiation (Sergelidis, 2019).

Rigorous safety testing and compliance with regulatory standards will help address potential consumer concerns and build confidence in lab-grown meat. Careful screening for pathogens and contaminants combined with strict quality control during manufacturing is imperative (Ong et al., 2021). Obtaining regulatory approval from agencies like the FDA and USDA demonstrates oversight and safety.

Environmental sustainability of production methods should be demonstrated through life cycle assessments (LCAs) accounting for factors like energy use, emissions and raw material inputs (Mattick et al., 2015). Communicating the results of such studies can reinforce the ecological benefits compared to conventional meat.

Finally, transparent labeling that provides consumers clear information on the origin and production process of lab-grown meat will be important for acceptance and adoption (Failla et al., 2023). Descriptive designations help inform purchasing decisions.

Addressing these areas will allow developers of lab-grown meat to create products that match or exceed traditional meat in terms of sensory factors, nutritional content, safety and sustainability.

3 Consumer Perceptions and Attitudes

Understanding consumer perceptions, motivations and potential barriers regarding lab-grown meat is essential for its successful introduction and adoption.

Qualitative techniques like interviews and focus groups provide deeper insights into the values, concerns and ambivalence consumers may feel toward lab-grown meat (Laestadius & Caldwell, 2015). For example, doubts about naturalness and mixed perceptions of high-tech food production emerge in focus groups. Interviews reveal nuanced risk-benefit calculations regarding ethics, environment, and personal health. These methods reveal complex psychological factors shaping attitudes. Cultural and religious values also play a role, as do varying levels of trust in institutions. Incorporating findings from qualitative research provides a more complete understanding of consumer decision-making.

Recent surveys indicate that only around one-third of consumers are currently accepting of cultured meat products, with cost, taste, and perceived naturalness being top concerns (Bryant & Barnett, 2018). However, between two-thirds to three-quarters are open to trying lab-grown meat, motivated by potential benefits like sustainability, animal welfare and health (Wilks & Phillips, 2017). Quantifying these perceptions is key.

Demographic factors correlate with acceptance, with younger generations more open to radical food innovations. Urban, liberal, educated consumers also exhibit greater receptiveness to lab-grown meat compared to rural, conservative and less educated segments (Circus & Robison, 2018). Targeting aligned groups can drive early adoption.

Ongoing consumer research across diverse segments will be invaluable. Techniques like conjoint analysis can quantify preferences and willingness-to-pay, while choice modeling examines actual purchase decisions (Wilks & Phillips, 2017). Surveys should track key performance indicators over time.

These findings will inform educational and promotional initiatives to shift consumer perceptions and build acceptance in both retail and foodservice channels. Monitoring online conversations also provides real-time insights into evolving attitudes. While skepticism persists in some groups, systematic research and engagement can identify effective strategies for expanding consumer appeal.

4 Role of Neuroscience

Neuromarketing techniques that measure brain activity provide novel insights into consumer decision-making that can inform efforts to develop and market lab-grown meat.

Tools like functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) enable researchers to pinpoint specific regions of the brain activated in response to marketing messages or product concepts (Bryant & Barnett, 2018). This identifies patterns tied to positive or negative perceptions that can be used to refine communication materials.

Electroencephalography (EEG) detects electrical activity in the brain, helping decipher cognitive processing and emotional engagement with branding elements like logos, names or packaging (Khushaba et al., 2013). These inputs guide design choices to spark favorable reactions.

Biometric measures like galvanic skin response and eye tracking also indicate emotional arousal and attention patterns when consumers view ads or evaluate products (Riedl et al., 2020). This data helps optimize marketing content and formats.

At the retail level, mobile EEG headsets could provide real-time neural feedback as shoppers weigh purchase decisions and respond to pricing or promotions (Fisher et al., 2010).

While consumers are often not consciously aware of their deeper motivations, neuroimaging reveals the unfiltered responses that drive behavior. These tools are particularly valuable for radical innovations like lab-grown meat where past precedents are limited.

The choice to buy lab-grown meat involves complex risk-benefit calculations that neuroscience can unpack. Combining neuromarketing and traditional consumer research provides a more complete perspective on consumer psychology to accelerator lab-grown meat's path to market.

5 Marketing Strategies

Marketing lab-grown meat requires strategic and targeted initiatives tailored to consumer segments most likely to initially adopt this novel product.

As an disruptive innovation, lab-grown meat should first focus on innovators and early adopters who are intrigued by new technologies and exhibit less risk aversion (M. Rogers, 2003). Engaging these groups helps drive word-of-mouth and advocacy.

Leveraging social media and partnering with influencers, environmental groups and technology sites exposes lab-grown meat to aligned audiences receptive to its sustainability and high-tech nature (Goodwin & Shoulders, 2013). Hashtags and shareable visual content should be part of the social strategy.

Messaging should focus on safety, nutritional parity with conventional meat, and ecological benefits, as these factors are likely top concerns and motivations (Circus & Robison, 2018). The higher production costs currently can also be framed as premium "clean meat".

Monitoring social listening platforms like Reddit and Twitter provides invaluable real-time insight into consumer conversations, questions and attitudes to continually refine communication (Verbeke et al., 2015). Viral moments can be capitalized on.

As production scales and costs decrease, neuromarketing and consumer studies will identify how to pragmatically broaden the appeal of lab-grown meat to the mainstream (Verbeke et al., 2015). This may require adjustments to communication and pricing.

Just as plant-based alternatives have steadily gained acceptance, employing these targeted marketing strategies based on data-driven insights about early adopters can help establish lab-grown meat as part of the future food system.

6 Conclusion

The development and marketing of lab-grown meat requires an interdisciplinary approach that integrates scientific innovation, consumer research, and neuromarketing.

Lab-grown meat holds immense promise as a sustainable alternative to conventional animal agriculture that can help address environmental and ethical concerns. However, realizing this potential requires creating products that match the sensory experience of traditional meat while reassuring consumers of its safety, nutrition, and ecological advantages.

Ongoing research into consumer perceptions, motivations, and decision-making processes is crucial. Quantitative surveys, qualitative studies, and neuromarketing tools provide complementary insights that allow marketers to identify positioning, messaging, and engagement strategies that will foster adoption by specific consumer segments.

From a product development standpoint, factors like taste, texture, nutritional content, safety, and sustainability metrics must all be rigorously evaluated and optimized through iteration and testing. Transparent, descriptive labeling and branding also play a key role.

Targeted marketing efforts focused on innovators and early adopters can gradually expand lab-grown meat's appeal as production scales and costs decrease over time. With responsiveness to consumer feedback and effective communication of its benefits, lab-grown meat can potentially transform the food system and how meat is produced and consumed globally.

The multidisciplinary research, commercialization, and marketing of lab-grown meat remains in its early stages but promises to chart an exciting path forward for sustainable protein. Ongoing advances and insights will determine how quickly and broadly this technological innovation disrupts the traditional animal meat industry.

References

Bryant, C., & Barnett, J. (2018). Consumer acceptance of cultured meat: A systematic review. *143*, 8–17.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0309174017314602 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Circus, V. E., & Robison, R. (2018). Exploring perceptions of sustainable proteins and meat attachment. *121*(2), 533–545. Publisher: Emerald Publishing Limited.
URL https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2018-0025 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Datar, I., & Betti, M. (2010). Possibilities for an in vitro meat production system. *11*(1), 13–22.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1466856409001222 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Failla, M., Hopfer, H., & Wee, J. (2023). Evaluation of public submissions to the USDA for labeling of cell-cultured meat in the united states. *10*, 1197111.
URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10514362/ (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Fisher, C. E., Chin, L., & Klitzman, R. (2010). Defining neuromarketing: practices and professional challenges. *18*(4), 230–237.

Fraeye, I., Kratka, M., Vandenburgh, H., & Thorrez, L. (2020). Sensorial and nutritional aspects of cultured meat in comparison to traditional meat: Much to be inferred. *7*.
URL https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnut.2020.00035 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Goodwin, J. N., & Shoulders, C. W. (2013). The future of meat: A qualitative analysis of cultured meat media coverage. *95*(3), 445–450.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0309174013002210 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Khushaba, R. N., Wise, C., Kodagoda, S., Louviere, J., Kahn, B. E., & Townsend, C. (2013). Consumer neuroscience: Assessing the brain response to marketing stimuli using electroencephalogram (EEG) and eye tracking. *40*(9), 3803–3812.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417412013371 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Kumar, P., Sharma, N., Sharma, S., Mehta, N., Verma, A. K., Chemmalar, S., & Sazili, A. Q. (2021). In-vitro meat: a promising solution for sustainability of meat sector. *63*(4), 693–724. Publisher: Korean Society of Animal Science and Technology.
URL http://www.ejast.org/archive/view_article?pid=jast-63-4-693 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Laestadius, L. I., & Caldwell, M. A. (2015). Is the future of meat palatable? perceptions of in vitro meat as evidenced by online news comments. *18*(13), 2457–2467. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.

URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition/article/is-the-future-of-meat-palatable-perceptions-of-in-vitro-meat-as-evidenced-by-online-news-comments/99ABC527FD839475BDD0BDEB2727F3F6 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

M. Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations, 5th Edition*.
URL https://www.simonandschuster.com/books/Diffusion-of-Innovations-5th-Edition/Everett-M-Rogers/9780743222099 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Mattick, C. S., Landis, A. E., Allenby, B. R., & Genovese, N. J. (2015). Anticipatory life cycle analysis of in vitro biomass cultivation for cultured meat production in the united states. *49*(19), 11941–11949. Publisher: American Chemical Society.
URL https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b01614 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Ong, K. J., Johnston, J., Datar, I., Sewalt, V., Holmes, D., & Shatkin, J. A. (2021). Food safety considerations and research priorities for the cultured meat and seafood industry. *20*(6), 5421–5448.

Post, M. J. (2012). Cultured meat from stem cells: Challenges and prospects. *92*(3), 297–301.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0309174012001210 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Riedl, R., Fischer, T., Léger, P.-M., & Davis, F. D. (2020). A decade of NeuroIS research: Progress, challenges, and future directions. *51*(3), 13–54.
URL https://doi.org/10.1145/3410977.3410980 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Sergelidis, D. (2019). Lab grown meat: The future sustainable alternative to meat or a novel functional food? *17*(1), 12440–12444. Company: Biomedres Distributor: Biomedres Institution: Biomedres Label: Biomedres Publisher: Biomedical Research Network+, LLC.
URL https://biomedres.us/fulltexts/BJSTR.MS.ID.002930.php (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Specht, E. A., Welch, D. R., Rees Clayton, E. M., & Lagally, C. D. (2018). Opportunities for applying biomedical production and manufacturing methods to the development of the clean meat industry. *132*, 161–168.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1369703X1830024X (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Stephens, N., Di Silvio, L., Dunsford, I., Ellis, M., Glencross, A., & Sexton, A. (2018). Bringing cultured meat to market: Technical, socio-political, and regulatory challenges in cellular agriculture. *78*, 155–166.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0924224417303400 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Tuomisto, H. L., & Teixeira de Mattos, M. J. (2011). Environmental impacts of cultured meat production. *45*(14), 6117–6123. Publisher: American Chemical Society.
URL https://doi.org/10.1021/es200130u (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Verbeke, W., Marcu, A., Rutsaert, P., Gaspar, R., Seibt, B., Fletcher, D., & Barnett, J. (2015). 'would you eat cultured meat?': Consumers' reactions and attitude formation in belgium, portugal and the united kingdom. *102*, 49–58.
URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0309174014005014 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)

Wilks, M., & Phillips, C. J. C. (2017). Attitudes to in vitro meat: A survey of potential consumers in the united states. *12*(2), e0171904. Publisher: Public Library of Science.
URL https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0171904 (Accessed at: 2023-10-10)