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ABSTRACT

Consumers in Western societies are increasingly called upon to reduce their consumption of meat to help alleviate the many environmental consequences of industrial livestock production. Dominant discourses around sustainable consumption, including meat reduction, understand consumption as driven by the attitudes, values and choices of individuals, portrayed as responsible for consuming in unsustainable ways and change to come about when individuals choose to act differently. In contrast, by framing consumption as embedded in social practices, this thesis emphasises how broader cultural, social and material condition’s structure eating and hence meat consumption. A focus on practices shifts attention away from the individualisation of responsibility towards the many actors who has a hand in reproducing and sustaining meat-intense eating.

The thesis explores the experiences, approaches and challenges of nine Norwegian meat reducers through in-depth interviewing coupled with structured food diaries. In doing so, it seeks to understand what enables and complicates efforts at meat reduction in Norwegian households. A main finding is how efforts to reduce meat consumption are influenced by social forces of which individuals do not assert much control. The findings suggest that through processes of socialisation and habituation, performances of eating often intuitively conforms to the prevailing conventions inscribed in socio-material environment in which they are embedded, thus, emphasising the influence of social norms and material affordances in enabling and complicating meat reduction. Furthermore, the findings suggest that the dependence on timesaving and hassle-free ways to eat in everyday life, coupled with a meat-intense repertoire of convenient cooking and a foodscape that heavily facilitates convenient meat-eating, pushes people towards meat-dependent convenience. Moreover, the analysis elaborates on the concept of bounded creativity to highlight how informants’ creative and innovative efforts at doing meat reduction are rooted in and circumscribed by bodily, material and social elements – which in essence limit the possible ways in which meat reduction might be carried out. In sum, the research findings in this thesis suggest that a radical change towards meat-reduced diets seems unlikely without fundamental changes to the social, physical and economic structures that reproduce meat consumption as the appropriate, easy and cheapest way to eat.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Meat-heavy diets in Western societies are the subject of great controversy, for matters of sustainability, public health, and animal welfare (Bonnet et al. 2020). In recent years, the public discourse has fixated particularly on the environmental burdens connected to meat eating and consumers have increasingly been called upon to reduce their consumption of meat as a measure to help save the planet. The call to arms is convincingly communicated through and across Western media, where eating less meat is typically depicted as ‘the single biggest thing’ an individual can do to fight climate change (see e.g., Carrington 2018, Nace 2018). Indeed, it appears that ‘meat consumption is no longer a private matter’ (Deutsche Welle 2020). In Norway, meat consumption is frequently challenged by activists, scientists, environmental agencies and political parties alike, who urge people to moderate their meaty diets. Although many consumers appear to be onboard with the idea (Bugge and Alfnes 2018), the growing interest in meat-reduced eating has caused negligible changes in meat-consumption figures (Ytterdahl 2020). This thesis aims to contribute a nuanced understanding of the experiences, approaches, and challenges faced by people who attempt to reduce their consumption of meat. The study also seeks to shed light on why intentions might not always translate into action.

1.1. Setting the scene

1.1.1. The global burden of meat consumption
The topic of meat consumption has received increasing attention due to its many documented concerns regarding sustainability; significant loss of biodiversity (Machovina, Feeley, and Ripple 2015, Westhoek et al. 2011) substantial soil and water contamination (Pimentel 1996) and indications of the threat to food security due to extensive land grabbing for the purpose of meat production (Lovera 2015). Yet, in light of the looming climate change crisis, its most harmful impact is perhaps that of greenhouse gas emissions, with livestock emitting roughly 14.5% of human-induced emissions globally (Gerber et al. 2013). Indeed, the transition towards more plant-based diets has been recognized as a vital, though undeveloped, area of action towards fighting climate change (Pachauri, Gomez-Echeverri, and Riahi 2014). A recent research report stipulates that a change towards diets that excludes animal products altogether have ‘transformative potential’, for instance by reducing land use for food production by 76% and cutting total food related GhG emissions in half (Poore and Nemecek 2018). Withstanding the growing awareness of these dire consequences, consumption of meat continues to rise globally and is expected to do so in the future (OECD/FAO 2020) and state-led initiatives to
reduce consumption remain scarce (Bailey, Froggatt, and Wellesley 2014). This backdrop demonstrates the critical need to understand what drives meat consumption and the capacities for reducing it – a topic that is yet to receive the attention it deserves (Dibb and Fitzpatrick 2014). Across policy and research, the recognition of meat production as environmentally problematic has been coupled with certain dominant narratives that attribute the problem and its solutions to individuals, whose choices are treated as the key determinator and target of intervention.

1.1.2. Framings of the problem and the solution: all eyes on the individual
The discourse on sustainable consumption has been dominated by the widespread trust in consumers - depicted as ‘autonomous agents of choice and change’ (Shove 2010, 1279) - to solve environmental issues through their purchasing power in a demand-driven, self-regulating market economy (Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015). This depiction is anchored in the prominent understanding of resource consumption as driven by consumers attitudes, values, and choices. Individuals are thus made responsible for ‘consuming in unsustainable ways’, leaving the possibility for change as something which is dependent on individuals who must choose to act differently (Walker 2014, 46 - 47). These framings have been central in the discourse on food sustainability, in which negative developments are often explained by people's lack of knowledge and motivation, while the dissemination of scientifically supported information is understood to change people’s ways of eating (Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015).

1.1.2.1. Individualistic framings in empirical research on sustainable meat consumption
The notion that social change is driven by aggregated individual choices has inspired an individualistic research paradigm on sustainable consumption (Shove 2010) with an aim to understand ‘drivers’ for, and ‘barriers’ against, pro-environmental behaviour (Evans 2019). Research on meat consumption seem to follow suit. Attending mostly to ‘individual explanatory factors’ (Austgulen et al. 2018), the main barrier is often depicted as uninformed consumers, who are unaware of the environmental burdens of meat eating (De Boer, Schösler, and Boersema 2013, Dibb and Fitzpatrick 2014, Lea and Worsley 2008, Tobler, Visschers, and Siegrist 2011). This is anchored in the assumption that such knowledge would motivate less meat eating (Verain, Dagevos, and Antonides 2015a). Furthermore, different studies have described the significance of personal values and motivations to explain meat eating behaviour (De Boer et al. 2013, De Boer, Hoogland, and Boersema 2007), establishing that moral beliefs are key in motivating people to abstain from meat (Bobić et al. 2012, Lindeman and Väänänen
While research on meat abstinence, i.e., vegetarianism and veganism, have received a lot of academic attention (see e.g., review in Ruby 2012), moderation, or ‘flexitarianism’ has received comparatively less (Verain, Dagevos, and Antonides 2015b, 211, Mylan 2018, 2). Within this literature, the increased interest in meat-reduced eating has been interpreted as a way individuals deliberatively communicate desired identities through lifestyle choices (Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1270).

Overall, contextual factors like social norms or physical affordances are far less researched (Austgulen et al. 2018). Yet, it has been suggested that people’s awareness of social norms may both impede and inspire meat-reduced eating, depending on the underlying normative beliefs (Macdiarmid, Douglas, and Campbell 2016, Verain et al. 2015b, Wyker and Davison 2010). Others have implied that the relative affordability of meat might hinder or drive meat-reduced eating, because ‘monetary considerations strongly influence peoples food choices’ (Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1270). Nevertheless, contextual factors tend to be described as ‘external constrains on consumer choice’ (Austgulen 2014, 49) hence, upholding the focus on individuals and their choices as the main driver of consumption. Subsequent policy recommendations typically depict consumers as potential change agents for reducing the environmental burdens of meat eating (see e.g., De Bakker and Dagevos 2012, Verain et al. 2015b).

1.1.2.2. Individualizing responsibility
The ‘individualization of responsibility’ (Maniates 2001) is clearly reflected in the current discourse on sustainable meat consumption (Austgulen 2014, Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015). There are few signs of political will to regulate meat production and consumption, possibly due to the risk of public backlash and the resistance from powerful interest groups such as the livestock sector (Bailey et al. 2014). When it comes to handling unsustainable ways of eating, like that of meat consumption, governments typically take on a passive role as providers of information (Austgulen 2014) grounded in the idea that knowledge might convince people to change their ways of eating (Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015). The problem is that policy interventions aimed at changing people’s attitudes and choices often prove unproductive (Walker 2014, 46-47). For instance, nutritional guidelines or food labelling schemes have been shown to be rather ineffective in encouraging people to ‘eat better’ (Warde 2016, 132). One explanation is that knowledge and motivation seem to be rather week predictors of environmentally benign behaviour (Kollmuss and Agyeman 2002). Indeed, the observation that people do not always act according to their green values, a so called ‘value-action gap’ (Blake
1999), is well established in the literature (see e.g., Barr 2006, Holden and Linnerud 2011, Loughnan, Haslam, and Bastian 2010). Hence, the efficacy of a consumer driven change towards a significant reduction of meat consumption, where government interventions are limited to providing information, has been questioned (see e.g., Austgulen 2014, 62).

In more recent years there have been a surge in critique towards the restrictive set of theoretical assumptions that lay the foundation for dominant contemporary ideas about consumption and social change. According to Shove (2010), such framings simplify the influence of social and structural factors on the autonomy of the consumer - resulting in a flawed understanding of consumption and an unrealistic view of the consumer as a change agent towards sustainable levels of consumption. A growing number of scholars now argue that in order to take sustainability seriously, we need to go beyond the current dominance of individualistic and rational notions of consumption, including the flawed explanations this breeds and the kinds of (ineffective) policies it sustains (see e.g., Shove 2010, Strengers and Maller 2014, Wilhite 2016).

1.1.3. The Norwegian context of sustainable meat consumption

Averaging at roughly 75 kg annually (Animalia 2020), Norwegian meat-consumption levels per capita by far exceeds the global average of 42.5kg, as well as the estimated sustainable carrying capacity of ca 30kg per capita (Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015). Indeed, The National Institute of Consumer Research in Norway recently described the potential for changing towards more sustainable diets as ‘huge’ (Tangeland, Heidenstrøm, and Vittersø 2017). Perhaps more importantly, the limited understanding of the barriers towards more sustainable diets in households has been recognized as a serious knowledge gap (Klepp et al. 2018). In terms of emission cuts, a recent report highlights a change towards less meat intense diets as significantly rewarding (Miljødirektoratet 2020). However, to date, there has been little political will to reduce the production and consumption of meat in Norway (Milford and Kildal 2019). To the contrary, political priorities have, if anything, helped to promote the consumption of meat through agricultural regulations, resulting in increasingly cheaper meat on the market (Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015). Substantial promotion of inexpensive meat in grocery stores, used as a deliberative marketing ploy, has also been claimed to further induce high levels of meat consumption (Rosenberg og Vittersø 2014).

1 The local and global numbers presented here refer to the available supply of raw meat, i.e. carcass, including bones, trimmings and by-products, adjusted for cross-border trade, imports and exports (Hallström and Börjesson 2012, Animalia 2020).
The most recent climate action plan (Klima- og miljødepartementet 2021), recognizes a reduction in meat consumption as beneficial for both health and planet, nevertheless, in true neoliberalist fashion, the government depict their role as facilitators, hoping to change people’s attitudes through providing information, leaving any potential reduction of meat consumption solely in the hands of the consumer.

Previous studies have painted a picture of the Norwegian consumer as being reluctant towards reducing meat consumption and fairly uninformed on the matter of its environmental costs (e.g., Austgulen et al. 2018, Bellika 2013) arguing that the unwillingness to reduce meat consumption to some extent should be understood as a result of uninformed consumers (Austgulen et al. 2018). On the other hand, it has been claimed that meat nowadays holds a controversial status amongst norwegian consumers, which is reflected in a growing number of people who express an intention to reduce their consumption of meat (Bugge and Alfnes 2018). However, it does not seem like the increased interest in eating less meat has had any significant effect on official consumption figures (Animalia 2020), perhaps suggesting a value-action-gap. An interesting observation in this regard is how young adults display more interest in meat reduction relative to other consumer segments, yet eat the most meat across the Norwegian populace (Bugge and Alfnes 2018).

This backdrop provides justifications for the further study of meat consumption, particularly in the Norwegian context, and highlights some knowledge gaps in the literature which have guided the project design. To sum up, first, the benefits of reducing meat eating for environmental reasons are well established, and hence, second, there is a necessity to understand how a change towards less meat intense diets might come about. This second point represents a particular knowledge gap in the Norwegian context. Finally, there is a need for further investigation of meat consumption and meat reduction that moves beyond dominant individualist reductionism and related framings of the problem and its solution, which, to quote Shove (2010), ‘produces a blind spot at a particularly crucial point’ (1277) in time.

1.2. The response: bridging the knowledge gap
This research explores the experiences, approaches and challenges of nine Norwegian meat reducers, understood loosely as people who intend and attempt to reduce their consumption of meat. Respondents are mainly based in the greater Oslo region, providing input through self-completed food diaries and in-depth interviewing.

Conceptualizing these meat reducers as ‘carriers of practice’ (Shove, Pantzar, and Watson 2012) this thesis provides an alternative to the dominant framing of research on
sustainable meat consumption. By depicting the conventions of practices rather than attitudes and values held by individuals as the main driver of consumption and social change, this study employs a theoretical framework that seeks to move beyond reductionist rational accounts of consumption (Shove 2010) and to circumvent the value-action gap (Warde 2017, 197) – a gap that only present itself as confusing if one assumes that action is the persistent result of individual values (Shove 2010). In so doing, the study adds to a growing body of research on consumption with an emphasis on how broader cultural, social and institutional conditions structure mundane conduct (Mylan 2018, 12).

Furthermore, this research expand knowledge on the category of ‘meat reducers’ or ‘flexitarians’ which, as noted above, have received relatively less academic attention compared to meat abstinence. As an increasing numbers of Norwegians have reported a wish to reduce their consumption of meat, particularly in urban areas such as Oslo (Bugge and Alfnes 2018, Aasvang 2020), knowing what enable or complicates their efforts to reduce meat might prove particularly productive for matters of sustainability.

Exploring deliberate attempts at meat reduction presents an opportunity to direct empirical focus beyond motivations, often depicted as the dominant drivers of anti- or pro-environmental behaviour. The experiences of so-called motivated or knowledgeable consumers are particularly interesting because they may tell us something about the potential of a consumer-driven approach towards less meat-eating. As Isenhour (2010) points out; surely, consumers cannot be regarded as the main agents ensuring sustainability if there are obstacles even the more committed fail to overcome.

Finally, conducting this research in Norway helps answers to a local knowledge gap on the limited understanding of the barriers towards more sustainable diets across Norwegian households (Klepp et al. 2018, 10)

**1.2.1. Aims and research question**

This research aspires to advance the growing debate on sustainable diets by providing a novel interpretation of what enables and what complicates meat-reduced eating. It does so by turning the analytical gaze away from individual drivers and barriers, and towards the normative performance of practice. Furthermore, it aims to shed light on the potential for consumer-driven change towards less meat-intense eating, by investigating the experiences, approaches and challenges of people who attempt to perform meat-reduced eating.
Moving beyond the notion of meat consumption as driven by rational individual choices, this thesis explores the challenges of reducing meat consumption in Norwegian diets, using a practice theoretical framework. The leading question asks:

How are efforts to reduce meat consumption in Norwegian households enabled or complicated by existing food practices?

To answer my main research question, the following two sub-questions have guided the research:

1) Why and how do people perform meat reduction?
2) What factors complicate meat reduction in Norwegian households?

1.3. Reader’s guide
In this first (1) chapter, Introduction have presented the research topic, provided the rational for the research and introduced my research aims and question(s). As part of the literature review, I have identified relevant knowledge gaps and situated my research within the ongoing theoretical and political debate on sustainable consumption, and particularly meat consumption. The second (2) chapter Theoretical framework meat consumption as determined by practice, presents the theoretical concepts that has guided both the research and the analysis, where understanding meat consumption as the outcome of practices is central. Methodology and methods, the third (3) chapter, explains and justifies my practice-based methodological approach and research design. Special care is taken to rationalize the use of interviews coupled with food-diaries in practice-based research. I also address ethical concerns and methodological challenges here. The remainder of the thesis presents my findings, analysis and discussion. In Performing meat reduction (4) I address the first sub-question by describing how and why my informants attempts to reduce their consumption of meat. Exploring how informants are recruited to practice meat reduction and the different approaches they follow to perform meat-reduced eating, this chapter helps shed light on how meat-reduced eating is enabled. The following chapter (5) Complicating meat reduction, answers to the second sub question, examining how different bodily, material and social elements independently and jointly complicate efforts to reduce meat consumption. The last analytical chapter (6), Practicing meat consumption and meat reduction: convenience, normativity and bounded creativity, builds on
the preceding analysis and brings in further results to clarify central themes that emerge from this research. In the concluding chapter (7) I offer a summary of the research, political and practical implication, as well possible avenues for further research.
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: MEAT CONSUMPTION AS DETERMINED BY PRACTICE

2.1. Introduction: studying *practices* rather than individual drivers and barriers

2.1.1. Studying consumption
Consumption research in the social sciences first gained popularity following the emergence of mass-production in the US and western Europe during the mid-20th-century. Since then, the theme has been studied comprehensively, forming a multi-disciplinary and varied topic area (Warde 2014). According to Warde (2014) two conceptualizations of the consumer have dominated. The ‘sovereign consumer’, born from neoclassic economic thought, depicted as an independent, utility maximizing, rational actor and the ‘expressive individual’, inspired by the ‘cultural turn’ in social sciences, emphasising the symbolic aspects of consumption and its communicative capabilities, depicting an agent choosing to display lifestyle and identity through purchase. Although highly influential, the idea that consumption is driven by conscious and deliberate choices, central in the depiction of both the ‘sovereign consumer’ and ‘the expressive individual’, has been refuted by many (e.g., Shove 2010, Warde and Southerton 2012) Nonetheless, individualism prevails as the dominant model across all disciplines researching consumption (Warde 2014), including the growing research on sustainable consumption.

2.1.2. Sustainable consumption and the ABC-model
Sustainable consumption has received increased attention in policy debates and academia ever since the term was introduced at the UN conference on environment and development in Rio 1992. Ensuing policy debates has focused on one question in particular: whether individuals can bring about change alone or if a structural overhaul is needed (Hargreaves 2011). According to Spaargaren (2011) research on sustainable consumption has adopted either an ‘individualistic paradigm’ - seeing individuals and their attitudes as unit of analysis and their choices the aim of intervention – or a ‘systemic paradigm’, where producers and states has been the attention of analysis and socio-technical systems the target of intervention. As within consumption research in general, the individualistic focus has dominated, driven by social psychology and behavioural economics, studying ‘drivers of unsustainable consumption and barriers to the uptake of more sustainable ways of living’ (Evans 2019, 4) This approach has
been widely critiqued for oversimplifying behaviour change and consumption (e.g. Shove 2010; Hargreaves 2011), but also for giving individuals the responsibility for change towards more sustainable levels of consumption (e.g., Maniates 2001, Shove 2010). The latter has been described by Maniates (2001) as the ‘individualization of responsibility’, accused of neglecting the responsibility of governments and the system they sustain – systems that stimulate unsustainable ways of living (Hobson 2002, Isenhour 2010).

Elizabeth Shove – a highly influential voice in the critique of individualistic models of consumption - refers to this paradigm as the ABC-model, where Behaviour is a result of deliberative and rational Choices determined by Attitudes and values (Shove 2010). Rooted in the ‘theory of planned behaviour’, developed by Ajzen (1991), it suggests that the social world can be understood as an aggregate of individuals actions, derived from linear and rational processes of decision-making. Following this line of thought, policy interventions has been limited to non-intrusive measures such as ‘informing, pricing and advising’ (Shove 2010, 1275). The underlying idea is that environmentally concerned consumers will, through market mechanisms, be able to drive the societal change needed. At its most rudimentary level, advocates of the ABC-model might argue that individuals are not motivated to reduce, say, their meat intake, because they are not aware of its environmental consequences, or they simply do not care. However, as noted in the introduction, people do not always act according to their values, knowledge or intentions (Warde 2017, 193). In relation to eating, obesity provides a fitting example. Whilst nobody desires or seeks to be overweight, many still suffers from obesity, making it ‘one of the most unambiguous and intractable instances of the value-action gap’ Warde (2016, 116). In relation to meat eating, a similar phenomenon has been labelled the ‘meat paradox’, which describe the observation that people eat meat despite not supporting the harming or killing of animals (Bjørkdahl and Syse 2021, Loughnan et al. 2010). Indeed, attitudes have been acknowledged as relatively poor predictors of eating behaviour (Neuman (Neuman, Mylan, and Paddock 2019, 30). It may not come as a surprise then, that campaigns aimed at changing the way people eat by providing information have proved ‘notoriously prone to failure’ (Warde 2016, 132).

2.1.3. Reframing meat consumption as part of everyday practices
As illustrated in the introduction, the literature on meat consumption and meat reduction is largely based on individualistic explanations of behaviour. In reviewing this body of research, Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt (2017) sum up a multitude of ‘internal’ and ‘external’ factors that influence individual meat consumption, in a highly complex and bewildering model of
behaviour. Their policy recommendations verbalized in the familiar language of the ABC-model, proposing individuals as ‘change agents’ towards reduced meat consumption, with the help of governments strengthening their ‘abilities’ and ‘inclinations’ (1273). While this, and other individualistic models of behaviour, recognize the influence of external factors (see discussion in Kollmuss and Agyeman 2002) it treats them inadequately, if we are to follow Shove’s (2010) argumentation. She argues that by treating external factors – e.g., culture, social norms, physical infrastructure, technology, policy, institutions – as contextual influences on individuals’ capacity to behave in a preferred way, individualistic behavioural models oversimplify the role and power of such factors (Shove 2010, 2014). Following this critique theories of practice has been suggested to offer a more persuasive understanding of consumption, on that better capture the interplay between structure and agency. In theories of practice, external factors are not treated as separate from behaviour; ‘rather, they are themselves sustained and changed through the ongoing reproduction of social practice. In the language of ABC, the driver and the driven are as one’ (Shove 2010, 1279, emphasis added). Consequently; ‘anti- or pro-environmental actions are not seen as the result of individuals’ attitudes, values and beliefs constrained by various contextual ‘barriers’, but as embedded within and occurring as part of social practices’ (Hargreaves 2011, 82).

In consumer research, practice theory has been developed partly as a critique to the models of the sovereign consumer and the expressive individual, arguing that consumption is rarely a result of deliberate decision-making, but rather derived from highly routinised and habituated performance of social practices (Warde 2014, Borch 2016). It is not uncommon to see scholars utilize a practice theoretical framework to ‘go beyond’ individualist reductionism across social research (e.g., Strengers et al. 2014, Walker 2014). In the name of sustainable consumption, it has proved specifically productive at providing insight into the ordinary, yet resource-intensive activities that make up the fabric of everyday life, such as mobility (Hansen 2017) energy use (Wethal 2020, Winther and Bell 2018) as well as eating (Halkier 2010, Warde 2016) and food waste (Evans 2014). Many claim that practice theory offers a novel approach to understanding what influence food intake, one that gives analytical precedence to how practices, rooted in cultural and social settings, structure food consumption (see Holm, Lund, and Niva 2019, 1). While practice theorists have become fairly well acquainted with food related activities (e.g.,Warde 2016, Jackson and Viehoff 2016, Halkier 2016, 2009), few scholars have applied the theory to study meat consumption more specifically. Some exceptions exist, however, which have provided valuable insight into how infrastructure-practice relations are involved in processes of ‘meatification’ in China and Vietnam (Hansen and Jakobsen 2020)
and how changes in food practices and systems of provision can explain Vietnam’s meat boom (Hansen 2018).

From a theoretical point of view, this thesis builds further on Mylan (2018) exploratory attempt to understand meat reduction using Warde’s (2016) conceptualization of eating as a compound practice. This analytical focus on practices rather than individuals reframes meat consumption in two important ways. As dependent on the carrying out of practices, instead of individuals needs and wants, and hence, shift attention away from the notion of individual responsibility, towards ‘wider social, cultural and institutional constraints that shape conduct in everyday life’ (Mylan 2018, 12)

2.2. Meat reduction within the practice of eating, an analytical framework

This thesis conceptualizes meat consumption as the outcome of practice. I hereby sketch up a theoretical framework giving analytical supremacy to practices and their performances, wherein material resources are consumed. The basic premise rest on the idea that carrying out food practices, in a competent manner, requires certain ways of consuming and dealing with foodstuff, not only appropriate to standards of doing, say, ‘cooking’, ‘grocery shopping’ or ‘barbequing’, but also formed by seemingly unrelated practices and the accountabilities within, doing, say, ‘parenting’ ‘birthday-parties’ or ‘gender’. Instead of sticking strictly to one theory of practice, of which there are many, I lay out a reading of practice theory as an analytical toolkit. This entails approaching theory as sensitizing devices (Bryman 2016, 383) giving room for empirical data to tell the story and ‘bite back’ (Nicolini 2012, 217) on theory, rather than forcing pre-made plots on empirical material. Despite arguing for the merits of depicting eating and consumption of foodstuff as outcomes of practices, I do not claim that this is the ‘best’ or ‘only’ way to go about it. I use practice theory as a ‘instrument of selective attention’ (Warde 2016, 18), to emphasize particular features of meat consumption that seems somewhat neglected in dominant research on meat, by drawing attention to everyday food practices; to dispositions, embodied and tacitly reproduced ways of handling food, to conventions and standards; to the ‘prefiguration’ of social sites (Schatzki 2002, 225) drawing up ‘fields of possibilities’ (Heisserer and Rau 2017) inhibiting people from doing and seeing things differently.

2.2.1. Introducing theories of practice

A myriad of social theories taking regimes of routinized actions as the basis for conceptualizing social phenomena has been categorized under the banner of practice theory. These theories are
not unified and perhaps best referred to as ‘a group of theories with family resemblances’ (see Nicolini 2012 for an extensive summary). Forming the theoretical framework in this thesis is practice theory as formulated in the philosophical accounts of Theodore Schatzki (1996, 2002, 2010) developed for analytical purposes in the name of consumption, by Alan Warde (2005, 2013, 2016, 2014). Underpinning these formulations is a lineage of theories rooted in the philosophical ideas of Heidegger and Wittgenstein developed in close reference to the sociological theories of Bourdieu (1977) and Giddens (1984). Inherited from this ancestry of ideas are some fundamental notions about human activity that distinguish practice theory vis-à-vis behaviourist or structuralist theories, which will become more apparent as this chapter progress. Central is the idea of human conduct as intelligible; that is, in most circumstances, people do what it makes sense for them to do. What makes sense, however, ‘always manifest itself as part of an ongoing practical endeavor’ (Nicolini 2012, 162). It follows that the starting point for theorizing human affairs is not individuals nor structures, but the ongoing accomplishment of practices.

Aside from the elementary observations made above, the fabric of practice is subject to theoretical debate. I develop an analytical toolkit by drawing on authors in line with a ‘strong’ reading of practice theory (See Shove 2010, Welch and Warde 2015). Grounded in the ontological assumption that individuality and social order emerge from practice, I see them as compatible and hence possible to utilize as complementary ideas. This includes recognizing the casual powers of practices as ‘dynamic entities in their own right’ (Shove 2010, 1279, Welch and Warde 2015, 93). For consumption research, this implies decentring the ‘consumer’ from the analysis, to focus on ‘the [social] organization of the practice and the moments of consumption enjoined’ (Warde 2005, 146). To present some interrelated concepts as part of a ‘toolkit approach’ (Nicolini 2012, 213), I selectively review and expose some diversities and correspondences.

2.3. Practices
A useful first step towards sketching up a theory of practice is to provide a basic description of what a practice is. Following Schatzki we can define a practice as a 'nexus of doings and sayings' (1996, 89); which are linked in specific ways as to form an 'organized constellation of actions’ (2002, 71 emphasis added). At the most basic level, a practice can refer to any kind of assemblage of basic acts constituting a meaningful behaviour, for instance; ‘explaining or ‘describing’; types of dispersed practices, recognizable ‘across different domains of social life’ (Schatzki 2002, 88). Of particular interest here, however, are integrative practices; ‘the more
complex practices found in and constitutive of *particular* domains of social life’ (Schatzki 1996, 98 emphasis added), of which most are intricately linked to forms of material consumption (Warde 2005). Relevant examples being cooking and ‘eating out’, wherein foodstuffs are appropriated and consumed.

Common amongst practice theorists is to conceptualize integrative practices as routinely made up of *bodily*, *social* and *material* components (See Gram-Hanssen 2010 for a summary) depicting practices as ‘enduring [socio-material] regimes of activity’ (Nicolini 2012, 227). However, scholars are not unified on the matter of which elements to include which significance to give them and how they link up to form practices (Reckwitz 2002, Sahakian and Wilhite 2014, Schatzki 1996, Shove et al. 2012, Warde 2005). As touched upon in the above this theoretical framework departs from Schatzki’s (1996, 2002, 2010) philosophical accounts, supplemented with concepts derived from Bourdieu as developed by Warde (Warde 2013, 2016). This approach is followed for two main purposes. First, it opens up an understanding of practices as both stable and dynamic, necessary to fully understand what might enable or inhibit change towards less meat eating. Second, it enables a convincing conceptualization of the human subject, needed to fully apricate my empirical (individualistic data) - a subject that appears hidden in the broadly utilized elemental practice approach of Shove et al. (2012)

2.3.1. Schatzki’s organizing principles of practices
Using cooking as an example, I will attempt to unpack Schatzki’s organizing principles of practice. For explanatory purposes, I list Schatzki’s (2002) definition in full:


First, ‘open-ended and temporally evolving’ means that practices, although often routinely engaged and performed in a monotonous fashion, are not fixed but dynamic, unceasingly transforming through people’s continuous engagement in them. ‘Practices are literally reproduced on every novel occasion’ (Nicolini 2012, 226) . Second, all practices are constituted by a range of specific acts. Cooking might include the cleaning, chopping and frying of vegetables and specific ways of talking about the transformation of foodstuffs; ‘baking’ bread, or ‘whisking up some appetizers. Although not explicitly stated, ‘doings’ includes the use of artefacts and resources. Indeed, ‘[a]ctivities that compose practice are always bound up with material arrangements’ (Sandberg and Tsoukas 2016, 192). For example, the activities of
cooking might involve different kitchen supplies, foodstuffs and other resources such as water for boiling and electricity for frying. Third, what organizes these doings and sayings into a coherent and recognizable constellation of behaviour and ultimately shared by ‘indefinitely many others’ (Schatzki 1996, 105) are four interrelated mechanisms of linkage.

[1] **Practical understanding** refers to a form of tacit bodily ability, a ‘know-how’, of how to go about carrying out actions pertaining a specific practice. By engaging in and socialized to certain ways of cooking, people embody a practical understanding of how one handles a knife in order to cut vegetables or say, combine different ingredients into a recognizable meal, or ways to plate and ‘serve’ a dish for guests. To say that acts (doings and sayings) are organized by practical understanding is to say that they express a coherent understanding of what is happening; they are appropriate acts, done in a correct sequence fitting to the performance of a practice (Schatzki 2002, 78). For instance, opening the fridge, grabbing, chopping and later frying an onion, are linked through the understanding of doing ‘cooking’. These understandings are shared between people by virtue of practices being ‘mutually intelligible’ (Warde 2016, 39-40), making actors capable of recognizing performances and pass judgement on more or less appropriate acts pertaining to the practice in question.

A second way which acts are organized in practice is through [2] **rules**; explicit instructions and principles, specifying what to do. Examples are law-binding rules on how to drive, or less formal instructions found in recipe books, dictating how to cook. In saying that rules link acts together, Schatzki convey the simple point that people follow shared rules when carrying out practices (2002, 79 - 80). Yet, as Warde (2016, 40) points out, such ‘rules’ are typically embodied and tacitly followed. For instance, when cooking up a dish people often implicitly reproduce a recipe which was once learned from, say, reading a cooking book. Such rules may be established by actors of authority, which hints at deliberative coordination of practice.

[3] **Teleoffective structures** ‘represent the purposive element of practices, the ends towards which engagement in the practice is oriented’ (Warde 2016, 40). It refers to the notion that most practices follow a certain course of order and direction and that there exist shared, often tacit, ‘standards’ to which the enactment of a practice should aspire. (Warde 2016, 48). For example, if the end is to prepare and serve a Christmas-dinner, there are a certain ‘normativized and hierarchically ordered’ (Schatzki 2002, 80) ways to go about doing so which links basic and non-basic acts together into a meaningful whole; sourcing out a specific type of meat, readying the oven, peeling and boiling potatoes, setting the table, slicing up meat etc., which in turn are connected to normativized moods and emotions (Schatzki 2002, 80) e.g.,
nostalgia, joy and cheerfulness. It is important to note that for Schatzki, these structures are properties of practices not people (source). In other words, teleoaffective structures indicate what practitioners are supposed to do and feel.

[4] General understandings refer to commonly shared viewpoints, concerns, values and pursuits that exceed and sits across integrative practices and the boundaries between them. Hence, they are not practice specific. These are ‘reflexive understandings of the overall project in which people are involved’ which help guide what it makes sense for people to do (Nicolini (2012, 167). And so, the concept gives attention to the potentially agentive forces of ‘widespread, adjacent or overarching cultural discourses’ (Welch and Warde 2015, 97), which ‘normatively condition the teleoaffective structures of practices’ (Welch 2020, 76). For instance, being healthy represent a commonly held value which may structure different practices, e.g., grocery shopping and cooking, through the performances of different dietary regimes.

These four organizational principles are what ‘glues’ practices together (Røpke 2009, 2492). In essence, they outline appropriate and proper conduct, indicating what action are more or less right and what ends are more or less valued.

2.4. How practices institute meaning and structure consumption
Central for Schatzki is the idea that practices institute meaning (Schatzki 2005), they provide intelligibility to what actors do and who they are (Sandberg and Tsoukas 2016, 192) meaning that human conduct is only meaningful as part of practice. (Accordingly, practice theory suggested that people consume for the sake of carrying out practices. Consumption is hence, not conceptualized as a practice per se, but ‘a moment in almost every practice’ (Warde 2005, 137). For instance, resources like water, foodstuffs and electricity or artefacts such as household appliances or, say knives, are instrumental in the carrying out of food practices. As Halkier (2017) puts it, ‘practices imply, afford or invite consumption’ (195). Since performances of practices are normatively structured, consumption is understood to be guided by the conventions of practice (Warde 2017, 86 - 87) rather than individual values, needs and ‘wants’, as the ABC-model contends.

2.5. Practices, performances and human actors
So far, we have established the basic claim that the conventions of practice guide meaningful behaviour and hence also structure acts of consumption. However, practice scholars divide on
how and to what degree practices allegedly direct, guide or constitute the actions of human actors (Rouse 2007), that is, their performances. The central idea is that people and their acts, should be understood, at least to some degree, as social products of the practices in which they partake (see e.g., Bourdieu 1977, Schatzki 1996, 2002). In this subchapter I draw up the theoretical idea that performances are the result of the coming together of socialized actors and normative practices, by drawing up a theoretical separation between (1) practices-as-entities (2) practices-as-performances and (3) human actors. Building on ideas from Schatzki and Bourdieu, I put forward a conceptualization of performances that I argue is able to account for both conformity and regularity, but also individuality and creativity. Enabling a depiction of practices as both stable and dynamic.

2.5.1. Practices as entities and practices as performance
Fundamental to most theories of practice is the idea of a recursive relationship between practice and its performances (see e.g., Bourdieu 1977, Schatzki 1996, Shove et al. 2012, Warde 2016). The basic idea is that a performance presupposes a practice, and practices are sustained and transformed through actors’ enactments of them (Schatzki 1996, 90). While Schatzki seem hesitant about giving practices ontological existence beyond the sum of its performances (see e.g., Schatzki 2003) prominent practice scholars such as Warde (2016) and Shove et al. (2012) draw up a distinction between ‘practices-as-entities’ and ‘practices-as-performance’ for analytical purposes, so to treat practices as emergent entities with causal powers. Making these separations, we can think of practices as socially coordinated entities, ‘historically and collectively constructed’, which provide templates for meaningful and appropriate behaviour, performances as ‘the grounded enactment of practices conducted as and amid everyday contingencies’ (Pohlmann 2018, 66).

2.5.1.1. Practice as socially coordinated entities
To reiterate, practices prescribe standards of which performances ‘should’ aspire. Warde (2013, 2016) points out that both individuals and organizations tacitly and purposefully, explicitly or implicitly, participate in the social coordination of practice and hence the setting of these standards. As hinted at in the above, social coordination may transpire both informally and formally. Informally through shared, often tacit, understandings of normative behaviour. Formally, through artefacts – infrastructure, commentary (both verbal and written) and institutions (Warde 2016). Indeed, codification and formalization of practices-as-entities are normal and even routine:
[t]eaching institutions, professional bodies and voluntary associations operate to prescribe, instruct and transmit the procedures constituting practices in which they have a stake, they have the effect of codifying proper procedure, or ‘good practice’ (Warde 2016, 46).

What counts as satisfactory performances of a practice, as 'proper procedure', is to varying degrees shared, codified and formalized (Warde 2016). It follows that the degree of social coordination varies from one practice to another. For instance, the practice of driving is tangled up with strict rules, infrastructure and materials heavily limiting possible ways to perform (cars, roads, signs etc), while eating in the home opens up for more flexible enactments than eating out, delimited by norms of etiquette and menus prescribing how to eat (Warde, Paddock, and Whillans 2020). As described by Schatzki (see 1996, 124), the stronger the coordination, i.e. the more it stipulates correct ways of doing (teleologies, behaviours and affectivities) the greater is the degree to which it determines what makes sense to do for an actor. In other words, less totalitarian practices provide more space for individuality. Directing attention towards actors that contribute in the setting of standards thus help situate authority and power in practices (Warde 2016). For Shove, highlighting the institutionalization of power in directing performances has been central in her criticism of mainstream behavioural change campaigns and the individualization of responsibility (see e.g., 2010, 2014) Since the degree of formalization and coordination says something about the mutability of specific practices (Warde 2013), thinking of practice as socially coordinated entities, and their scripting of meaningful behaviour, may help us better understand factors that may hamper or enable a change towards less meat intense eating.

2.5.1.2. Practices as performances
To reiterate, practices provide standards of which individual behaviour aspire. However, it is important to note that practice-as-entities do not produce uniform enactments. Rather;

performances are best seen as continual improvisations within more or less precise or fuzzy parameters which permit confirmation that each displays sufficient similarity to be recognizable as an example of that particular Practice (Warde 2016, 46).

In other words, practice theory leaves room for individuality. To fully apricate what it means for practice to structure consumption, we need to understand the role of human actors and the nature of their performances. Here, Schatzki and Bourdieu draw up distinct, yet
complementary, ways to conceptualize performances, which enables the analysis of actor’s doings and sayings, without reverting to individualism.

2.5.1.2.1. Performances as bounded re-interpretation of practice
A central emphasis for Schatzki is that actors, although shaped by previous engagement in practice ‘are not passive objects […] moulded into clones that perform stereotypical activities in common’ (Schatzki 1996, 53), but unique and active interpreters of practice. Human bodies are distinct in the sense of being a ‘unique crossing point of practices’ (Reckwitz 2002, 256), both previously performed and currently held. Following Schatzki, we can think of individuality in two ways. First, through previous socialization people adopt a particular set of ‘mental conditions' (Schatzki 2002, 81) and bodily repertoires of doings and sayings (Schatzki 1996, 53). Second, these characteristics are expressed in future performances, which is, in turn, often qualified by multiple extant practices. As put by Nicolini (2012, 172) ‘[p]ractices, usually more than one, constitute fields of action intelligibility [i.e., a field of possible courses of action], that, in turn, inform participants about what makes sense for them to do next’. Seeing people as the unique crossing point of practices implies, then, that what makes sense to do is a corollary of one’s embodied understandings of the world, adopted through past experience, and the multiple extant practices wherein this understanding is carried out. It also implies that practices are preformed differently. People perform ‘cooking’ in different ways, while still adhering to what is acceptable conduct within that practice. Schatzki emphasize the point that people are unique and express individuality by drawing up a separation between the organizational underpinnings of practice – i.e., rules, practical understandings and teleoaffectivities – and individuals capacity to act. While practices draw up templates of meaningful behavior, it is, according to Schatzki, individuals ‘practical intelligibility’ that ultimately govern actions. Although moulded through practice, practical intelligibility is essentially an individualist phenomenon, which convey that ‘it is always to an individual that a specific action makes sense’ (Schatzki 2002, 75). In other words, whereas practices and its organizational principles form ‘horizons of possible intelligibility’ (Schatzki 2005) guiding what makes sense to do, they do not completely structure performances. As Warde notes, ‘it is essential to take care not to anthropomorphize Practices. Practices do not themselves do anything; qua entities they do not give performances’ (Warde 2016, 45). Rather, following Schatzki, it is the coming together of practice entities and unique bodies that ultimately give performances, hence acknowledging the agency of structure and individual bodies.
Referring to Schatzki’s work, Nicolini (2012, 173) notes that ‘practices only provide the site, and the “work” of living still needs to be done’. Essential is the role of people as active interpreters of practice. Since no situation is ever identical people’s practical intelligibility is unceasingly provoked to improvise or experiment (Jaeger-Erben and Rückert-John 2015). Hence, when people re-produce practices through their performances they are not passive but active ‘interpreters of practices’ meaning that they ‘link, incorporate, and perform the different rudiments comprising a practice’ (Pohlmann 2018, 65). Hence, following Schatzki, we can say that people re-interpret practice on every novel occasion (Nicolini 2012, 226) and express themselves, while doing so (Schatzki 1996, 53).

The idea that people re-interpret practice and that embodied capacities to act are unique to the individual actor, means that performances always entail some form of ingenuity and individuality, albeit always bounded by the extant socio-material circumstances and horizons of intelligibility qualified by practice (Nicolini 2012, 225 - 226). Nicolini (2012) description of ‘practicing’ as ‘bounded creativity’ (226) fittingly captures this tension between newness and boundedness. Hence, following Schatzki, we can apricate performances as bounded re-interpretation, as dynamic enactments, opening up for change, instability and individuality. It is on this basis Schatzki depict practices as open-ended and temporally evolving, as noted in the above.

2.5.1.2.2. Performances as habituated re-production of practices
Similar to Schatzki, Bourdieu claimed that by engaging in the social world people adopt certain ways of doing and thinking that comes into play, rather intuitively, in future doings. However, Bourdieu seems to put more emphasis on how social and personal histories, such as upbringing and social class, inscribed in the body works to determine and homogenize future actions (Grenfell 2008, 49 - 65). Central to his theory of practice is the concept of ‘habitus’, described by Crossley (2001, 93) as.

active residue or sediment of past experiences which functions within their present, shaping their perception, thought and action and thereby shaping social practices in a regular way. It consists in dispositions, schemas, forms of know-how and competence all of which function below the threshold of consciousness.

Here, regularized activity is explained on the basis that peoples capacity to arrange doings into meaningful practices ‘operates below the threshold of consciousness’. Seeing that this capacity to act is learned from shared experience, the concept of habitus postulates a great level of individual and collective consistency in behaviour (Warde 2016, 36-37).
Building on Bourdieu, Warde (2016) conceptualize performances as guided by a ‘practical sense’, described as a capacity to arrange doings and sayings into successful performances without much mental processing – ‘a knowing-how-to go on without thinking’ (Warde 2016, 79). Practical sense is made possible by practical experiences and socialization, where practical procedures are learned. Meaning that people acquire a repertoire of practical procedures and the practical sense to apply these procedures, competently, in the ever-folding stream of activity, without much reflexivity. The learning of step-by-step procedures in a given sequence make people capable of ordering unit acts into a meaningful routine. If making mash potato’s is the routine, then learned procedures such as turning leavers, washing, peeling, boiling and mashing potato’s, represent the ‘building blocks’ (Warde 2016, 123). The concept of ‘routine’ convey that acts are chronologically available to the performer and may be enacted without the actor being consciously aware of each rudimentary step. Learned chronological orchestration of unit acts, tacitly repeated, suggest inclinations to follow time-bound and routinized sequences of action, emphasizing the importance of sequence and flow (Warde 2016, 126-130). In essence, repeated arranging of procedures into sequences leads to the habituation of practical routines, which Warde suggest, denote ‘the means by which people mostly get most things done, in more or less the same way as before, effectively, if not necessarily with optimal efficiency’ (Warde 2016, 128) For instance, think of the highly tacit routine of putting together a dish frequently eaten at home.

It is important to note that practical experience sediments as dispositions; inclinations to prefer some acts, procedures, or routines over others. Meaning that practical sense always operates through dispositions to select appropriate command of procedures in future doings (Warde 2016, 146). Dispositions anchors the point that people’s choice, say, of what to eat, are heavily governed by the embodiment of preceding conditions, emphasizing the Bourdiousain notion that social and personal histories carry agency in future doings (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). By incorporating the concept of dispositions into Schatzki’s philosophical accounts, we might say that, amongst the manifolds of ‘paths’ qualified by the coming together of human actors and practice, specific routes may instinctively make more sense deepening on an actors’ dispositions. For instance, how some may be dispositioned towards grabbing a hot dog, rather than an apple, on the way home from work, to alleviate hunger. While the ABC-model of action contends that this is the result of choices made consciously prior to the implementation of acts, the concept of a dispositioned practical sense assumes learned, typically unconscious inclinations that steer behaviour – often replicating past performances in familiar circumstances (Warde 2016, 124-125). Hence, practical sense, dispositions and routine, are relevant
theoretical concepts for the study of meat reduction because they suggest that performances of eating might not be easily accessible and modified by conscious thought.

This interpretation (also) highlights that the organizational underpinnings of practice, is highly embodied in actors. Emerging Schatzki and Bourdieu, through Warde we can say that the rules, teleo-affectivities, practical and general understanding, that according to Schatzki belong to specific practices is, through repeated performances, highly embodied in human actors and subsequently performed, mostly unconsciously, in future performances. This underscores that acts can be purposeful, without being ‘consciously thought about or explicitly grasped’ (Schatzki 2010, 114) and that people can engage in normativized doings, while not being fully aware of the fact that they do so. Existence unfolds through activities of which we are just occasionally fully aware; we are able to link up acts that pertain to a practice without much personal deliberation or contemplation (Nicolini 2012, 166).

2.5.1.2.3. Bringing Schatzki and Bourdieu together

It is worth noting that Schatzki and Bourdieu’s depiction of human conduct converge and differ. For instance, Schatzki explicitly sets his understanding apart from Bourdieu which he accuses of providing too much of a deterministic account of action (Schatzki 2002, Schatzki 2005). Indeed, both Bourdieu’s theoretical schema, specifically habitus (Maggio 2018) have received criticisms for its supposed inability to account for social change. While acknowledging conceptual differences between Schatzki and Bourdieu, I see their ideas as supplementary, and argue that by bringing their philosophies together, we can open up an understanding of practices that may account for both social change and social stability, hence forming a richer theoretical toolbox. Treating ‘practice templates’ as ‘vague potentialities’ (Molander and Hartmann 2018, 374) while emphasizing the role of individuals as unique and active interpreters of practice, we can use Schatzki’s ideas to appreciate performances as ‘bounded creativity’ (Nicolini 2012, 225-226) allowing for individuality and newness and possibly altered re-interpretation of practices. By acknowledging the habitual state of being, granting agency to the potentially homogenizing effect of past performances, we can take inspiration from Bourdieu to apricate how embodied knowledge may provide stability and regularity in future performances.

To sum up, then, this thesis depicts people as unique ‘creatures of […] accumulated performances’ (Warde 2016, 50) that express individuality inside the confines of extant practices drawn up by its ‘normative accountability’ (Rouse 2007, 529-530). I argue that this highlights the significance of Reckwitz (2002) heavily paraphrased description of people as ‘body/minds who carry and carry out practices’ (256). People carry practices, in terms of
learned ways of being, doing and thinking. While carrying out practices they perform these learned ways of doing and thinking while guided by the normative confines of extant practices with its own logic and cumulative history. Henceforward, I utilize the concept of practical sense in a manner that incorporates aspects of Schatki’s ‘practical intelligibility’. An instinctive, largely subconscious capacity to perform practices. Predictable and constrained in the sense that it operates through dispositions and a bounded set of understandings, making it difficult for people to see and think differently. Inventive in its capacity to match dispositions to novel situations requiring action by way of improvising or experimenting.

2.6. **Added theoretical implications for the study of consumption and meat reduction**

This thesis conceptualizes performances as the result of the coming together of normative practices and socialized individuals. This carries certain affordances for the study of consumption, that goes beyond the initial claim that the conventions of practices steer consumption. Although heavily interdependent and co-constitutive, I argue that the three-way parting of (1) practice (2) performances and (3) individual actors, is an analytically useful one for the study of meat reduction. The separation highlights how the agentic capacity of social and personal histories in the body may conflict with the normative accountability of the practice. Indeed, as Heisserer and Rau (2017) points out, ‘tensions may arise between the practice-internal teleoaffiective structure and individual practitioners’ understanding’ (587). I suggest that this is particularly relevant when people are ‘recruited’ (Shove et al. 2012, 66 - 69) to new ways of doing. An individual who has newly adopted the project of doing meat reduction, may still carry a meat-intense repertoire of dishes, that could complicate the implementation of a meat reduced diet. Hypothetically, people might adopt the understanding that meat reduction is a good thing, even be strongly motivated to reduce their consumption of meat, while struggling to do so because meat eating is heavily embodied or scripted as the appropriate way, maybe the ‘only’ way, to perform specific practices.

Furthermore, in order to fully appreciate the affordances of practice theory for the study of consumption, or efforts to abstain from certain ways of consuming i.e., meat reduction, we need to establish the significance of seeing the world as made up of practices. To not confuse my arguments, I have deliberatively not elaborated further on how practices, in plural, qualifies performances. Central to Schatzki’s theoretical schema is the idea that network of interdependent practices constitutes social orders, that is, the arrangement of people, things (Schatzki 2002, XI), time and space (Schatzki 2010). Essential is the observation that
performances are always embedded in and occurring as part of a context qualified by a mesh of practices and their social orders. Schatzki refer to these specific contexts, ‘where things exist and events happen’, as ‘social sites’ (Schatzki 2002, 63). The idea of social sites emphasize that acts are rarely qualified by just one practice – albeit performance of one specific practice often take centre stage - but the outcome of an intricate interplay between multiple practices, the theoretical implications of which can be made rather complex (see e.g., Schatzki 2002, 226).

For instance, what a person eats for dinner could be shaped not only by practices such as doing ‘grocery shopping’ and ‘cooking’ but also seemingly unrelated practices such as doing ‘mothering’ which may entail specific ways of putting together a meal appropriate to ensure the health of children. Moreover, by establishing spatiotemporal orders, performance of eating dinner might be tangled into the temporal-spatial web of doing ‘work’, ‘commuting’, ‘grocery shopping’, ‘cooking’ ‘eating’ and ‘soccer practice’ (or other practice-related hobbies for that sake), which in turn impact how it can be carried out, i.e. what makes sense for a person to do. As such, practices ‘overlap, interweave, cohere, conflict, diverge, scatter and enable as well as constrain each other’ (Schatzki 2002, 156-157). For instance, buying and serving a frozen pizza for one's kids can make perfect sense to do, while not being a ‘rational choice’ aligned with understandings of ‘healthy eating’ and ‘being a good parent’ which one carries. It may have made perfect sense because that was what the ‘prefiguration’ of the ‘social site’ qualified as sensible. Think of the physical environment; walking past a deli on the way home, the ‘time squeeze’ (Southerton 2003); available time to shop, cook and eat dinner, between work and kids’ soccer practice, and the social norms which prescribe the serving of frozen pizzas as a satisfactory performance. In this thesis I use the concept of ‘site’ when referring to specific socio-material contexts that capture how acts are always embedded in, and emerging as part of, ‘network of practices and their social orders’ (Heisserer and Rau 2017, 586). In essence, social sites ‘determine the meaning and significance of, confer value to, and prefigure, i.e. constrain and enable, what occurs in them’ (Pohlmann 2018, 79). Thus, saying that performances are the coming together of human actors and practice, is the same as saying that performances are the coming together of human actors and social site. It follows that to understand what enables and complicates meat reduction we have to apricate the agency of site and individual bodies.

To sum up, by equipping individuals with practical sense, dispositions, understandings and knowledge, laying down rules of appropriate behaviour, both explicit and tacit, and producing a social and physical environment that encourage certain ways of performing and discourage others, ‘practices draw up fields of possibilities’ (Heisserer and Rau 2017). Hence, we can think of agency as prefigured by socialized bodies and extant structures which 'qualifies courses of
action in a variety of ways', not merely as *enabling* or *constraining*, but in terms of making courses of actions more or less feasible, relevant, complicated and so forth (Schatzki 2002, 225). This thesis may only capture fields of possibilities that enables or complicate meat reduction across different sites, *by proxy*, that is, through the sayings and doings of individuals. To describe what is practical and socially doable to a given actor in a given situation I borrow the term ‘do-abilities’ from Halkier (2010). Key theoretical concepts are summed up in table 1.

**Table 1: Practice theoretical key concepts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice (practice-as -entities)</td>
<td>- Enduring, abstract and normative socio-material regimes of activity, historically and collectively constructed, which ‘exists between and beyond specific enactments’ (Shove 2014, 418) organized by, (1) practical understandings, (2) rules, (3) teleoaffective structures and (4) general understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performances (practice-as performances)</td>
<td>- The grounded enactment of practices conducted as and amid everyday possibilities - Actor and practice emerge in performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human actors (practical sense, dispositions)</td>
<td>- Actors carries and carries out practice - Furnished with a <em>dispositioned practical sense</em>; an embodied capacity go on without thinking, often instigated through the means of practical <em>routines</em>; tacitly enacted chronological orchestration of unit acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sites</td>
<td>- specific socio-material contexts, capturing how acts are always embedded in, and emerging as part of a network of practices and their social orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of possibilities</td>
<td>- Both structure and individual bodies prefigure agency in multiple ways. Practices draw up fields of possibilities by furnishing people with understandings and knowledge, drawing up rules for appropriate behaviour (explicit and tacit) and producing a social and physical environment that encourage specific ways of performing and discourage others (Heisserer and Rau 2017, 586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do-abilities</td>
<td>- What is ‘possible to do and how it is possible to perform in the carrying out of a practice’ for the unique actor (Halkier 2010, 44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7. The practice of eating

In conceptualizing eating as a practice, Warde, finds that the categorization of practices as either dispersed or integrative as insufficient, and propose the need of a different formulation; one which acknowledges that practices are shaped by the manner of their formalization, with consequences, especially, for the setting of standards of performance’ (Warde 2013, 24). Eating, he argues,

...presupposes the intersection of at least four integrative practices; (1) the supplying of food (2) cooking, (3) the organization of meal occasion and (4) aesthetic judgements of taste. These are in turn ‘formalized by nutrition, cooking, etiquette and gastronomy (Warde 2013, 24)

Accordingly, Warde term eating a ‘compound practice’ (Warde 2013, 24). This thesis follows Warde’s understanding of eating as constituted by these four, distinct, yet entwined, sets of integrative practices, anchored in their own organizational underpinnings (i.e., understandings, rules and teleoaffectivites). Following the theoretical stance laid out in the above, this entails that ‘food-choices’ are, first and foremost, seen as the multifaceted corollary of the intersection of said practices. Importantly though is not to lose sight of the seemingly unrelated practices that may affect eating, say, birthday celebrations or parenting practices. Hence, to investigate what facilitates or complicates meat reduction, we need to examine the ‘field of possibilities’ (Schatzki 1996, 167) that the current organization of eating ‘prefigures’ (Schatzki 2002, 226) and how the performances of said practices play out in the wider nexus of practices that constitute the social world. Maintaining a ‘Schatzkian’ logic, seeing performances as open-ended, entails that these ‘practice templates’ only prefigure ‘potentialities’ (Molander and Hartmann 2018, 374). To sufficiently grasp the orderly and repetitive fashion of eating, this thesis relies on Warde’s Bourdieusian inspired emphasis on bodily routines and the extant environment in which they are formed and on which they rely.

2.7.1. Habituated eating

The structuring effect of habituation seems particularly important when investigating eating, a practice coordinated by a manifold of, sometimes conflicting, organizational underpinnings. Seeing that the different integrative practices which make up eating have their own standards, structural logic and its own 'coordinating agents', the manifold of organizational underpinnings pertaining to the practice of eating opens up a space to be occupied by competing and contradictory codifications of appropriate ways to eat, including what to eat, leaving it ‘weakly coordinated’ and socially ‘disorganized’ (Warde 2013). Simply put, eating does not provide
clear-cut formalized standards of conduct. Theoretically then, eating seems to open up a wider room for diversity, flexibility and individuality, relatively to other forms of consumption, such as driving. Indeed, ‘there is a fair level of consensus about what it means to be a good driver. What it means to eat well is much less clear’ (Warde 2013, 25). Nonetheless, people mostly eat in a regularized pattern, suggesting some stabilizing influence of bodily routines and the environment on which they depend. Having written extensively on eating, Warde (2016) argues that habituation – described as ‘self-actuating dispositions or tendencies to engage in a previously adopted or acquired form of action’ (149) – is key to understanding why people, despite the multitude of possible enactments, eat in an orderly fashion and do so with little reflection. Think of the abundance of groceries available in your local supermarket compared to the limited variety of foodstuff that regularly end up in your shopping cart. Or how little reflexivity and innovation that goes into eating breakfast every morning. To say that habituation is central in performances of eating is to stress the significant role of (1) practical sense and (2) the ‘public cultural environment’ – in which this capacity is developed, and which guides its unfolding – in providing consistency across performances of eating. This understanding of eating rests on an intricate interpretation of the relationship between body and environment, where acts are understood to be triggered largely as tacit, habit-like, responses to observable patterns in recognizable surroundings, made possible by preceding repetition of eating in similar settings. In comparison with ABC model thinking:

[p]eople deploy what they have learned not primarily by consulting a stock of knowledge and deliberating, but rather through automatic implementation of sequences and previously rehearsed responses to clues made available in familiar settings which generate fluent practical action’ (Warde 2016, 138)

The significance of the extant environment is, hence, twofold. The environment holds a key role because to perform eating, people are fundamentally reliant upon available resources and their performances are structured by what is afforded by the extant environment. People may only consume the goods that are offered and available. Additionally, as pointed to in the above, people embody features of their environment. We incorporate conventional ways of eating and develop tastes through engaging in a socio-material context. This conveys three theoretical affordances for the study of eating, which I have largely adopted from Warde (2016, 111-115). First, the ‘public cultural environment’ (114) carries and suggest conventional ways of eating, that may indirectly and even subconsciously steer eating performances. Hence, clues and cues in the external environment plays its part in diffusing conventions of eating across individual
performances. Second, clues and cues may trigger acts more directly. For instance, as exemplified by my sample, the acknowledgment of an empty fridge may instigate shopping trips while advertisements of meat on sale may instigate purchases. Third, we might also depict environment as more or less constraining possible acts. The ‘material foodscape’, understood as the diversity of places where food is offered for purchase and consumption (Winson 2004), plays a significant role in allowing and limiting possible ways of eating. Thus, bounding performances. Phenomenon’s like ‘food desert’ or ‘food swamps’ - describing areas with a lack of healthy, or predominance of unhealthy, food outlets across a community (Fanzo and McLaren 2020) - is a pertinent example. Practices further up the food chain bounds the availability of foodstuff, pushing people towards specific ways of eating. Indeed, practices are spatially dependent, ‘geography has a significant impact on what people consume: not only are you what you eat, but you are also where you eat’ (O’Neill et al. 2019, 230). For instance, some meaty fast-food menus do not permit non-meat eating. Such infrastructural restraints may be ‘more constraining then directing’ (Warde 2016, 117)

It is important to note that this interpretation of eating does not disregard the idea of mental processing or reflexivity altogether but give it relatively less significance, particularly in their steering of mundane conduct, opposed to traditional ABC-thinking. Rather than calculated acts, performance of eating is understood largely as ‘passive monitoring’, guided by environmental prompts, conventions and physical affordances, ‘propelled’ by routinized procedures (Warde 2016, 130).

2.8. **Operationalizing eating using the three pillars of practice**

Seeing eating as the outcome of practice, involves an intricate relationship between body and extant environment. To make these ideas fit for analytical purpose I follow Wilhite and Sahakian in conceptualizing agency in consumption habits as *distributed* between *bodily, material* and *social* elements (See e.g., Wilhite 2012, Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). In so doing, I operationalize what I have thus far referred to as ‘structure’, ‘site’ or ‘public cultural environment’ into a material and a social component. In what follows I summarize the theoretical ideas I build on to analyse efforts of meat reduction using the ‘three pillars of practice’ (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014).

*The body*, as thoroughly described in the above, carry personal and social histories which are expressed, often automatically and with little mental deliberation, in future doings. Embodied competences – i.e., dispositions and available practical procedures (Warde 2016, 146) - enable certain doings while restricts people from doing and seeing differently. The
theorization of the body followed here acknowledge the many knee-jerk responses to stimulus, preformed automatically and mindlessly, typically conceptualized as ‘habit’ in ABC-model thinking (Warde 2016, 100-121). More importantly, though, the theory provides further conceptualization of repeated and routinized performances of which the notion of habit not adequately captures. To understand the nature of mundane performances of eating and people’s capability to mount specific acts into successful performance without much deliberation or reflexivity, this category incorporates concept of practical sense, disposition and routines. To say that social setting or social norms carry agency is to say that practices prescribe normative ways of doing, dictating appropriate ways to do, think and feel. These norms can be reflexively grasped and pondered but are often tacitly accepted and enacted (tacit understandings). Noted above, for consumption, this means that it is the norms and expectation of practice that steer consumption, not individual desires or choices. Since practices often comprise interplay between human beings (Røpke 2009, 2492) this category includes normative ways of performing roles and responsibilities. For instance, performing ‘dinner hosting’ scripts normativized ways of serving up a meal.

In order to illustrate throughout this thesis how eating might be heavily steered by the material environment, I will borrow the concept of ‘scripting’ from Verbeek (Verbeek 2006), albeit, in a wider interpretation. He argues that all materials carry the capacity to encourage some doings and deject others, hence ‘scripting’ distinct performances. On the basis of what has been laid out in this theoretical chapter, one can imagine how the physical environment may more or less script certain ways of eating or make some ways of eating more or less feasible or challenging, possibly scripting meat consumption as the sensible thing to do. Restaurants are pertinent examples. Meat-based restaurant without non-meat alternatives come with a clear-cut meat-eating script. A restaurant, with plenty of vegetarian alternatives on the menu, come with a less meat inducive script.

And so, the operationalization of agency in eating followed in this thesis are summarized as illustrated in the table 2. It is important to note however, that these three pillars are highly interdependent. Whilst analytical useful to make this separation it is important to maintain the point that ‘the driver and the driven are as one’ (Shove 2010, 1279). For instance, practices are by virtue of their own logic social. Social norms are infused in both bodily routines and physical environment. Hence, to be clear, their separation is of analytical and structural intent only, not a reintroduction of individualistic notions of consumption.
Table 2: The three pillars of practice and the prefiguration of agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human actors</th>
<th>Agency distributed across</th>
<th>How agency is prefigured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodies</td>
<td>Practical sense, dispositions and routines</td>
<td>- Available repertoires of bodily procedures and routines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Understandings (practical and general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dispositioned to prefer some acts over others. Tendency to repeat acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure/social site</td>
<td>Material context (material arrangements, things, objects)</td>
<td>- Affords, guides or scripts particular action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social context</td>
<td>(norms, social roles other human actors)</td>
<td>- Different practices, provide meaning/intelligibility and dictate acceptable, appropriate, and valuable conduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. METHODOLOGY
In this chapter I present my research design and the ontological and epistemological underpinnings on which it rests. The research takes a constructivist view of knowledge production and is carried out using qualitative, in depth, semi-structured interviews coupled with semi-structured solicited diary accounts. Before presenting the methods, I pay due attention to the ongoing debate on the methodological implications of a practice-based ontology. I do so in order to defend and provide a rationale for my interview-based research design against a certain scepticism in the literature towards the use of interviews to study practices.

3.1. Ontological and epistemological footings
To take ontology seriously, is to use ontological concepts thus.
(Schatzki 2016, 40)
Assumption about the nature of the social world (ontologies) and how social phenomena can be studied (epistemologies) are important philosophical matters that influence the research questions we ask and how we go about answering them (Seale 2018, 11 - 23). Most practice-based scholars would probably agree with Shove (2017, no page) in that 'taking "practice" as a central conceptual unit of enquiry generates a range of distinctive questions' yet, just as likely, those authors might disagree profoundly on how to best study these practices (e.g. see Jonas, Littig, and Wroblewski 2017). As pointed out by writers such as Schatzki (2016) and Nicolini (2012), the distinctive ontologies that imbued practice theory have significant implications for research; to take these ontologies seriously, we ought to proceed with a coherent methodological approach to empirical research. Yet, divergent conceptualisation (see e.g. Welch and Warde 2015), within the heterogeneous family of practice theories (Nicolini 2012), have generated a diverse range of methodological approaches to the study of practices (Jonas et al. 2017). Against the eclectic methodological landscape of practice-based research, I will provide an explicit explanation of my methodological approach to the study of eating as a practice and the ontological and epistemological underpinnings on which this research project rests.

---

2 the contrast between Shove’s and Spaargaren’s application of practice theory is rather starch and provide a great example of the divergence within theories of practice (Welch and Warde 2015)
3.1.1. A flat site-ontology

Practice theories, at least the ones following a ‘strong’ reading, (introduced in theory chapter) share (at minimum) two important ontological traits: (1) that practices are the site of the social, ‘where understanding is structured and intelligibility [...] articulated’ (Schatzki 1996, 12) and, (2) that ‘the realm of the social is entirely laid out on a single level’ (Spaargaren, Lamers, and Weenink 2016, 8), i.e. the level of practices. Accordingly, not individuals nor large systems or structures, but practices form the basis of any description of the social world. Furthermore, there are no stratifications of social phenomena beyond the level of practices, as proposed by micro/macro analysis or transition theories such as the multi-level perspective (e.g., Geels 2002). The features of a site ontology are probably best exemplified when juxtaposed with two conflicting ontologies: (1) 'individualist', nominalist ontology and (2) the ‘socialist’ contextualist ontology. Ontological individualism – not to be confused with methodological individualism\(^3\) - holds that individuals, their properties and interrelations make up social reality. Social phenomena, then, can be understood as a complex accumulation of the action and mental states of individuals (Schatzki 2016, 30). On the contrary, the ‘socialist' ontology, holds the idea of a 'social totality' existing beyond the amalgamation of its parts (e.g., individuals), which, as systems or structures, exert causal powers (Schatzki 1996, 2-3), thereby suggesting that to understand sociality, we need to understand structures existing beyond the individual. Site ontology, on the other hand, takes a unique look at sociality; not formed by individuals alone, nor enveloped by large structures or systems, but as constituted through practices (Schatzki 1996)\(^4\). As such, the site ontology position occupies a middle ground, incorporating the nominalist feature of individualism, i.e., seeing larger social phenomena as constituted by nexus and bundles of practices, and the contextualist feature of a socialist ontology, i.e. that peoples intelligibility are shaped in practices.

Seeing practices – carried and reproduced across time and space by competent practitioners – as the building blocks of the social world, align with a 'social constructivist ontology’ in so far that constructivism guides analysis towards how social dynamics are produced and reproduced socially (Halkier and Jensen 2011). Seeing social reality as constructed, rather than existing independent of actors, warrants the study of 'social reality as an ongoing accomplishment of social actors' (Bryman 2016, 30), in turn, allowing us to study the mutual constitution and recursive relationship between agents and structures (Halkier and

\(^3\) Methodological individualism claims the social world ought to be studied through individuals, regardless of the social ontology one follows (e.g. individualist or structuralist)

\(^4\) The site is practice (Shatksi 1996).
Jensen 2011). Indeed, constructivism enables us to ‘look at the fine detail of people's activities without treating social organisation as a purely external force’ and thus, people cease to be ‘cultural dopes’ but rather, ‘skillfully reproduce the moral order’ (Silverman 2018, 39)

3.2. Epistemology
Taking a (social) constructivist approach to knowledge production, this thesis rejects the positivist-realist stance that there exists a social world independent of the inquirer of which one can attain objective truths (Seale 2018, 11-12). Staying true to the view of sociality as constructed (through practices), it follows that knowledge and research is similarly constructed (through practices) and situated in a social context embodied by the producer of such knowledge (Gherardi 2008). In doing constructivist research, we aim to expose processes of meaning construction and describe what and how meanings are embodied in the linguistics and activities of (social) actors. It follows that ‘to prepare an interpretation is itself to construct a reading of these meanings; it is to offer the inquirer’s construction of the constructions of the actors one studies’ (Schwandt 1994, 222). Given the act of interpretation inherent in doing social research, we cannot claim to produce objective knowledge. Truth is not ‘discovered by mind’ but rather ‘created’ (Schwandt 1994, 236), and so, the knowledge we create ‘is always somebody’s knowledge’ (Moses and Knutsen 2007, 194). Contrary to the positivist aspiration of producing objective research, we can choose to acknowledge how the decisions we make, the biases we carry and the contextual underpinnings of our research influence the knowledge we produce (Bryman 2016, 388). Throughout this chapter I have attempted to follow this plea, by providing reflexivity and transparency.

3.2.1.1. On accessing practices through the individual with a constructivist view of the social
The ontological decentring of the human subject (Shove et al. 2012, 22) has sparked a debate on whether studying practice call for methods that decentre the individual (see Shove 2017) implying the superiority of some techniques, e.g. observation, over others, e.g. interviews (Halkier 2017). I agree that following practice theory necessitates an analytical decentring of individuals, but not necessarily a methodologically one. Studying meaning-making at the levels of subjects, through interviewing, need not assume an individualistic ontology (see above) in so far that subjectivity and meaning are conceptualised as ‘constituted in practice’ not in individual ‘minds’ (Simonsen 2007, 169), and analytical precedence is given to the carrying out of practice.
Rejecting the Cartesian idea that consciousness is disembodied, practice theory sees individuals as ‘body/minds who carry and carry out social practices’ (Reckwitz 2002, 256). If individuals do indeed ‘carry’ and ‘carry out’ practices, it follows that we can access practices and its properties through their performances (doings and sayings), studying the formation of specific practices in tandem with the ‘performer’. Further, by directing our analysis towards the intersubjective, we can illuminate shared elements of practices and its configurations. In other words, in line with a social constructivist approach, we gain analytical access to the broader practice by looking for processes of shared meaning-making amongst practitioners. Thus, while one 'true' understanding of practice is out of reach, we can assess a more or less credible representation of practices and their properties.

This approach is in line with a strong reading of practice theory, because, although values, knowledge and motivations do not belong to the practitioner per se (See theory chapter) but rather to the practice, practitioners carry these properties and knowledgeably employ them through performances. Taking this stance, it follows that we might illuminate the configurations of practices through the eyes of the practitioners, using interviews.

### 3.3. A practice-based methodology.

‘the question of how to put theoretical considerations resulting from the practice turn into empirical research, today, is assumed to be one of the most pressing problems of practice-based studies’ (Pichelstorfer 2017, 84)

Current disputes on the methodological implications of practice based research are far from unified or conclusive; some privileging specific techniques, often observation (Schmidt 2017, Sedláčko 2017), while others call for methodological multiplicity (e.g., Halkier 2017, Shove 2017). Made evident by this debate is a general sense of scepticism towards using practitioners as informants about the practices they carry - that is, studying practices through interview talk.

Observation related methods are regarded by many as a ‘golden standard’ in practice-oriented research, better equipped to illuminate practices than, e.g. interviewing (Halkier 2017). This reflects a broader discussion in the social sciences on the merits of observation versus interview, wherein the former is assumed to generate more valid and authentic data on behaviour. For instance, O’Leary (2017) promotes observation as a technique that allows researchers to ‘explore what people actually do, and not just what they say they do’ (252 emphasis added). This argument seems to reflect a belief that the link between action and talk is problematic because explanations might be distorted, thus questioning the accuracy and
reliability of peoples accounts (Atkinson and Coffey 2003). Moreover, in the field of practice-based research, doubts has been raised about the capacity of informants to reflect on the habitual, mundane and tacit aspects of everyday doings – posing observation-like methods as the only true way to access such elements (e.g. see Jonas et al. 2017 for multiple examples). A related critique label interview talk as an unbalanced portrayal of everyday practices; giving to much attention to the ‘discursively constructed representation’ of practices and not enough to the ‘embodied and tacit dimensions’ (Halkier 2017, 197). Contrary to these critiques, it has been demonstrated that informants can talk about mundane, tacit doings (Hitchings 2012) and reflect on performativity, implicit rules and norms (Browne 2016a), when utilizing appropriate interviewing techniques, e.g. being ‘willing to ask [about] the seemingly obvious’ (Hitchings 2012, 66). Indeed, we can design our interview-based-method in ways that ensure a better balance of the embodied and discursive elements of practice through the way we produce empirical data and how we go about analysing them (Halkier 2017).

The methodology in this thesis have been designed with attention to this on-going debate. While resting on the assumption that interviews can indeed illuminate aspects of practices, particularly when designed properly, it incorporates complimentary diary-methods to make up for the shortcomings of interviews to address tacit behaviour. In presenting my research design I illustrate why this combination of methods provide particularly useful when researching meat reduction within the broader practice of eating.

3.4. A research design with sensibilities for practice

The ontological, epistemological and methodological reflections introduced above are the foundations on which my research design is built, instrumental in the carrying out of data production and empirical analysis. It has guided a multi-method qualitative approach to the study of meat-reduction, with a sensibility for practice.

3.4.1. A qualitative, multi-method approach

This study takes a qualitative, multi-methods approach, where in-depth interviewing has been coupled with self-completed food diaries, to research meat consumption across several integral food-practices, that make up the practice of eating. The choice of qualitative research design follows the purpose of the study. This approach, contrary to quantitative research, enables a dense analysis of social phenomena, allowing us to expose the ‘rich detail of practices and the way they unfold’ (Spaargaren et al. 2016, 12). In turn, facilitating a ‘thick textual renditions of
(...) practices’ (Nicolini 2012, 219). Although quantitative methods may help illuminate the patterns and trajectory of practices in a general population (e.g. see Browne 2016b), they cannot give adequate proximity to practices (Schatzki 2012). Indeed, it seems problematic to generate a sufficient description of situated practices and their dynamics, relying solely on quantitative methods (Spaargaren et al. 2016).

A multi-method approach was used for several reasons. First, to provide a broader range of empirical data, second to enhance the credibility of the research through ‘methodological triangulation’ (Seale 2018, 575) and third, to better balance the discursive and tacit elements of practice in my empirical findings.

3.4.2. Methods
In this thesis, data was gathered through a 2-step-process, by the use of self-completed food diaries followed up by in-depth interviewing. The latter method constituted the primary mode of data collection. The interviews lasted between 1.5 h and 2.5h, per informant; they were recorded using a digital audio recorder, fully transcribed using F4, coded in NVivo and then thematically analysed. To best illuminate practices, both the interview guide and the diary were developed with a practice ontology in mind and structured around specific food practices, such as eating occasion, cooking and grocery shopping.

3.4.2.1. Self-completed food diaries.
First, the informants filled out a one-week food diary, more accurately labelled as structured ‘solicited diary’ accounts; that is, accounts produced by the informant(s) on request (Bell 1998). Informants were asked to log (a) every meal occasion, (b) every instant of cooking, and (c) every food purchase throughout seven consecutive days (one week) and provide details on the foodstuffs used. The three different categories of food handling each required their unique set of fixed details to be provided upon entry. These details concerned the social and physical setting in which eating, cooking or food purchasing took place (see appendix 1). Diaries were structured in this way for several reasons: (1) to be able to provide a snapshot of the food related rhythms of everyday life in the course of a week, (2) to understand the influence of social and physical settings on what foodstuff was consumed (3), enable the ability to draw up patterns of doing – for example, does meat consumption repeat itself in particular circumstances? - and (4) create possibilities to compare doings internally, but also across respondents.
Also driving the structuring and design of the diary was the aim to ensure easy and time effective entries on behalf of my informants. To further safe-guard efficient and correct entries, the diary came with a pre-filled example and written instruction. Moreover, all my informants were introduced to the method by phone which allowed for questions to be asked and possible misunderstandings to be resolved. They were all given the choice to log electronically, using Excel or by hand on paper. Informants were asked to log daily to avoid the distortion of memory and ensure accurate entries. The diaries were delivered on completion and importantly, before the interview took place. Despite the effort put into communicating unambiguous practical step-by-step information and making diaries painless to complete, some informants experienced difficulties. One informant postponed the completion of the diary on multiple occasion due to a busy schedule. Others found it difficult to log daily. People commonly admitted to filling in the diary every other day or less frequently. It is worth noting that delayed entries may have distorted the accuracy of entries, despite my informants arguing that it did not. A sample of the diary is presented in appendix 1.

3.4.2.2. In depth interviews

Interviews were scheduled to occur after the diary was fully completed, as to allow the probing of findings from the diary in the interview. Interviews were conducted at a place requested by the interviewee and lasted between 1.5 – 2h. All interviews were conducted one-to-one. The interviews were semi-structured directed by an interview guide and divided into two parts. The first part focused on individual dispositions, food-related understandings and their motivations for doing meat-reduction, while the second and main part revolved around meat reduction across different food-related practices.

Conducting semi-structured interviews helped me direct the conversation towards the elements of practice (elaborated below), rather than properties of the individual (see Shove 2017) without overtly directing the conversation, ensuring precedence to the worldview of my informants. I also followed a semi-structured approach for the dual need of flexibility and consistency during interviews. This allowed me to ensure that core topics were covered in all interviews - such as the integrative practices that make up eating - to allow for parallels to be drawn and connections to be made across themes and responses. The flexibility inherent in the semi-structured approach allowed me to re-adjust interviews to account for experience gained and to trail interesting topics that emerged during the conversation (Bryman 2016, 466 - 469). More importantly, it allowed me to tailor each interview according to diary entries of particular interest.
To balance the doings and sayings of practices in my empirical data, the interviews were explicitly designed to better incorporate tacitly embodied elements of practice, by asking my informants to ‘reconstruct their ways of doing through personal narratives’ (O’Neill et al. 2019, 227), often with reference to particular events - e.g. could you tell me how you go about cooking a meal for your friends, step by step? - and, probing taken-for-granted elements of food practices (inspired by Hitchings 2012, 64). For instance, the parents in my sample all engaged in the practice of preparing a lunch-box - i.e., ‘matpakke’ - for their younger children in a remarkably similar fashion; all serving sandwiches. When asked ‘why sandwiches’? they all gave answers along the lines of ‘just because’, or ‘that’s just how it is’, indicating the tacit ‘intelligibility’ of carrying a shared practice. ‘Vignette questions’ (Bryman 2016, 476) were used to examine how different contexts (i.e. practices) mould the enactment of meat-reduced diets by presenting real-life scenarios such as; your parents’ in-law are coming over for dinner, what do you serve them? Mundane practices were further investigated by talking about the possibility of enacting the practice in alternative ways and by following the elements of practice, probing materiality, norms, rules, affectivity and so on.

A sample of the interview guide, covering core topics discussed across all interviews is presented in Appendix 2. The interview guide attached here is a modified one, essentially a more effective and well-rounded than the original guide. I found the original interview guide to be a bit too ambitious in terms of asking to many questions and slightly off track in terms of focusing too much on questions that ultimately did little to advance the research aim (e.g., general concern about ethical consumer choices, question regarding responsibility etc.). Consequently, in the first couple of talks, before the guide was modified, the second and vital part of the interview, focusing on efforts of meat reduction, was rushed - possibly limiting the collection of valuable data.

3.4.2.3. **Rationale for choice of methods**

While it is easy to get caught up in the debate about the qualities of one method over another, it is essential not to forget that choice of methods ultimately depends on the enquiry. As Shove (2017) reminds us, the pressing issue is not whether observation, indeed, generates the more valid data on practices or if ‘people can talk about their practices’ (Hitchings 2012) or not. What matters most is what we are looking for; what we want to learn.

While observation might yield particular benefits in the study of situated activity, it appears less suitable as a means to study meat reduction across the many integrative practices that make up eating. I found interviews more suitable because they enable the possible
examination of multiple performances and their interrelationships across time and space, integral to a comprehensive investigation into eating as conceptualized in the theoretical framework. I use interviews not only to 'zoom in' on the localized and situated (e.g., cooking a dinner) but also to 'zoom out'; untangling the web of interrelated practices across time and space (e.g., the sequential and spatial ordering of going to work, picking up groceries on the way home, preparing a ready-made-meal, attending a gym-class)\(^5\). While not able to provide the level of proximity to practices as some ethnomethodological techniques might, interviews allow me to provide thorough accounts on the role of meat-eating across and within different food-practices and their ordering in time and space, without sacrificing too much of the proximity needed to investigate situated performances. Furthermore, using interviews allows me to ‘see through the eyes of the people being studied’ (Bryman 2016, 392) and understand the practice from the practitioners' point of view, which I find to be essential in exploring what complicates meat reduction. Indeed, assessing how people negotiate their food 'choices', across different food practices, enables me to investigate what it is about the practice of eating that implies or invite the consumption of particular foodstuffs, in turn uncovering the bounded agency of human subjects pertinent to the practice.

Diary methods were incorporated into the study to offer ‘accurate descriptions of everyday experience’, which ‘concern the natural ebb and flow of a person's life’ and provide data on the ‘mundane and apparently unimportant aspects of life’ Nezlek (2012, 3). As such, I see diary methods as complementing the interview and making up for some of what is missed when observation might be difficult. In providing an accurate snapshot of my informants eating patterns, the diary somewhat makes up for what the interviews lack, uncovering not just what the informants say they do, but what is actually done - at least to a large extent. It is worth noting that similar to interviews, it is up to the informant what is actually included in the diaries. Further, they supplement the interview accounts - highlighting discursivity - with empirical data emphasizing the mundane food-related rhythms of daily life. Moreover, diary accounts were utilized as a base for further discussions on food consumption and food-routines in the interviews, inspired by Wilhite (2008). The diaries provided a fruitful basis for exploring

\(^5\) Here I refer to Nicolini’s (2012) concepts of ‘zooming in’ and ‘zooming out’, where the former refers to the act of investigating specific practices in detail, while the latter refers to the trailing of its interrelationships and links to other practices in space and time. Following a ‘flat-site-ontology’, this is not to be mistaken with engaging in analysis on the micro-macro level.
practices with my informants. Having to ‘write out’ their food practices, several of my informants claimed to discover elements about their everyday doings that otherwise stayed unnoticed. Generally speaking, the act of ‘journaling’ seems to have increased the reflexivity of my participants, making them more capable of contemplating mundane and tacit doings. However, knowing that their food choices where to be logged and evaluated by a researcher, may have distorted the actual doings of my participants, making them more inclined to ‘succeed’ at consuming less meat.

3.5. Sample and recruitment

My non-random sample of informants identifying as meat-reducers were recruited purposively through a sampling process combining ‘purposive’, ‘snowballing-’ and ‘volunteer sampling’ strategies (O’Leary 2017, 210-211). A personal acquaintance of mine was hand-picked early on in the process, for the dual purpose of collecting data and tightening a rather large interview guide. Six were recruited through the referrals of colleagues, friends or through informants, while the last two volunteered through a call for participants distributed via email to employees at the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences underlying the faculty of Medicine at the University of Oslo (see appendix 3). One of the two voluntary respondents was referred to the call by his daughter.

The search for informants was narrowed down to urban areas, predominantly Oslo (for practical reasons) to ensure that the socio-material context in which my informants carry out meat reduction did not greatly differ. Although comparisons across the rural/urban divide could potentially provide interesting insight into the role of different contexts in enabling or complicating meat reduction, I consider this to be outside the scope of this thesis. All informants were recruited on the premise that they engaged in meat reduction. That is, that they all made attempts at reducing their consumption of meat. How they commenced meat reduction and on what motivational grounds were not decisive factors in the recruitment process, neither was any assessment of their success in doing so, though people performing strict vegan or vegetarian diets where excluded. While not aiming to be representative, deliberate efforts were made at trying to recruit a sample that covered a broad spectrum of meat-reducers to ensure a wide variation of meat-reducing enactments. The interviews revealed a variety in both approaches to meat-reduction and motivations.
3.5.1. Introducing informants
The sample consists of nine interviews all from different households. My informants is somewhat unevenly distributed between the ages of 22 – 76, wherein most can be categorized as young adults (22 - 35), one as middle aged (40), and two as older adults (62, 76). The split between genders is rather disproportionate compared to that of the general population, with twice as many females (6) than males (3). All interviewees live in urban areas and most of them are highly educated. Five of them have full time jobs, two are studying and two retired. The majority of informants live together with other people. Four live with smaller kids, three with a partner, one lives in a shared space with friends and one live alone. For detailed biographic information see Table 3.

The over-representations of females, individuals of younger age and of higher education may be explained in different ways. First, recruiting informants through the referrals of friends, colleagues and informants, probably skewed the recruitment in favor of people of similar sociodemographic characteristics as the researcher, i.e., highly educated young adult. Second, according to the literature, females, individuals of younger age and higher education, are inclined to eat less meat (Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1268), hence, it is probably amongst these segments of the population you will find most meat reducers. Third, highly educated people are probably more willing to partake in research projects compared to those with lower education.
Table 3. Socio-demographic profile of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Civil status</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sigrid</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Social scientists</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Domestic partner and two kids, age 6 and 3.</td>
<td>Household with kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ylva</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Jurist</td>
<td>Drammen(^6)</td>
<td>Husband and his two kids; age 7 and 5(^7)</td>
<td>Household with kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Jurist</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Husband and two kids, age 1 and 4.</td>
<td>Household with kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Master student</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Husband and two kids; age 3 and 4</td>
<td>Household with kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Jurist</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Lives alone</td>
<td>Solo living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikkel</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Bachelor's student</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>Living with two friends</td>
<td>Shared living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sverre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Consultant Human Resources</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Lives with wife</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Retired food researcher</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Lives with husband</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egil</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Retired economist</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>Lives with wife</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1.1. Sample limitations

Aiming to say something about what enables and complicated efforts of meat reduction, this thesis have purposively and strategically recruited a particular category of the population, defined here as *meat reducers*, and hence, do not seek to deliver findings generalizable to the wider Norwegian population (Bryman 2016, 408). Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge how the composition of my sample may skew the findings. For instance, many of my informants represents a socio-demographic segment typically depicted as particularly interested in meat reduction, i.e., young, urban, female (See e.g., Bugge and Alfnes 2018) and of high education (Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1268) and are thus likely experiencing more encouragement from likeminded peers compared to, for instance, older men or rural dwellers. Additionally, engaging in eating across an urban foodscape, which all my informants do, probably offers more opportunities for non-meat eating than compared to a rural foodscape. Indeed, there are reasons to believe that vegetarian eating is more accessible in the bigger cities, particularly, compared to the rural parts of Norway, with supermarkets providing a broader range of meat-replacement products to respond to a growing urban demand (See e.g.,

\(^6\) With a relatively high population density compared to other Norwegian cities (source: SSB) and in close proximity to Oslo, I include Drammen under the depiction of urban.

\(^7\) Kids live there every other weekend.
Norgesgruppen 2019, Thanem 2019) and the rise of vegetarian and vegan eateries in urban areas (Skreiberg 2018). To put it simply, a more balanced sample, including more men, elderly and informants of rural residency would probably generate different barriers and enablers than what is presented here.

### 3.6. Positionality and methodological challenges

As mentioned above, in line with a constructivist approach to research, this thesis recognizes that research is never completely neutral. Research is always produced by people positioned in a social context ‘whose knowledge reflects its values’ and is by virtue of its own existence, biased (Seale 2018, 45). Hence, I find it appropriate to provide clarity about my own positionality in relation to the topic of enquiry, to provide reflexivity. I research this topic from the standpoint of a former meat-reducer turned vegetarian. Admittedly, I hold certain opinions and values that have motivated these ‘choices’. This experience has given me a heart-felt sympathy for those who try to consume less meat or adopt more sustainable ways of living in the general sense. There is no denying that this research was motivated by my own opinions on meat consumption and the skepticism towards the ‘individualization of responsibility’ evident in sustainable consumption. Despite having shaped the inquiry, I have made my best to leave these opinions and values behind when putting this research into life. Through ‘critical self-scrutiny’ (Seale 2018, 224) I have tried, as much as possible, not let them dictate the findings. My goal has been to give space for the participants to tell their story through this very thesis without my biases interfering. I have done so by following Byrne’s (2018) suggestion to conduct interviews using open-ended and flexible questions, to best access my informants ‘interpretations of events, understandings, experiences and opinions’ (220). I also made deliberate efforts not to overtly direct the conversation, but rather let their experiences guide the interview.

Another important step in performing reflexivity is assessing the possible impact of one’s own role as a researcher in the process of generating data. As noted by Seale (2018), the social role of the researcher may indeed impact the interaction in interviews (224). Some of my informants seemed to implicitly attach certain normative orientations towards meat consumption to my position as a student at the Center for Development and Environment (SUM), for instance, when referring to SUM as a place where people do not eat meat. There is a likelihood that this preconception may have skewed answers in attempts at conforming to the perceived normative opinions held by the researcher to escape social judgement. Additionally,
the increased depiction of meat eating in media as normatively wrong, may further distort answers for similar reasons. Discrepancies between diary entries and what was said in interviews may suggest this. Two steps were taken to avoid this consequence. First, I made sure to notify my informants from the beginning that my intention was not to judge or moralize, but to understand their particular experience. Additionally, I shared some personal experiences on the difficulties of reducing meat during interview, to express sympathy and understanding.

I will also note here that I had to postpone two interviews due to the social implication of COVID-19. These interviews were conducted late in the fall of 2020, after government regulation was eased and the circumstances allowed for it. Their diary entries were filled in and delivered before the onset of the pandemic. It is difficult to say exactly if and how this may have affected the findings. Although one of my informants reflected on how the social consequences of the pandemic had changed her diet slightly, in making it more meat-dependent, my overall impression is that both informants were capable of reflecting on their food patterns as they were pre-social lockdown. Nonetheless, having established this, I have at least provided the reader with the opportunity to better assess trustworthiness of the findings.

3.7. Establishing quality
Questions of how to ensure and evaluate quality in qualitative research have brought with it a proliferation of criteria, wherein the different principles suggested reflect varying degrees of commitment to a positivist versus constructivist view of knowledge production (Bryman 2016, 383-390). Situated closer to the relativist-constructivist understanding, acknowledging multiple realities rather than absolute ‘truths’, I have attempted to conduct my research with attention to quite different criteria than those suggested by the realist-positivist camp. To ensure quality in my research, I have adhered to the notion of trustworthiness along with reflexivity and relevance. As explained by Seale (2018, 574-577), trustworthiness relies on four criteria a) the level of credibility: the extent to which the research is believable and appropriate, possibly enhanced through triangulation; b) the degree to which we allow others to assess the transferability of the research by providing detailed descriptions of the social phenomena under scrutiny; c) by providing transparency in the process of documenting and reporting, we can strive for dependability by allowing other researches to ‘audit’ the research process and understand how and why we have reached our conclusions; and finally, d) by enabling auditing and providing reflexivity we can establish confirmability by illustrating how we have ensured personal biases not to affect the conduct of research. Importantly to note however, the trustworthiness of the research is ‘always negotiable and open-ended’ not a matter of ‘final-
proof’ (Seale 2018, 577). Hence, a lot of the work towards ensuring quality has been put into providing transparency as well as striving for reflexivity throughout this chapter to enable the reader to judge trustworthiness on their own terms and assess the findings accordingly.

The methodological triangulation of diary-entries and qualitative interviews seeks to improve the credibility of the research. Using diaries helped me expose some specific discrepancies between what people say about their meat eating versus what they actually do. Moreover, the ‘eye-opening’ exercise of writing out tacit doing seem to have encouraged my informants to talk about what they actually do, given that these entries provided a food related ‘reality-check’ for many of them. In other words, it has provided a basis for exploring reality with my informants. One respondent openly admitted to not having planned on talking about, in her words, the ‘embarrassing choice’, of serving her kids frozen pizzas, if it weren’t for the fact that she had to write it down in her diary. Triangulating methods in this way has proved to be effective in getting closer to the ‘truth’ and hence ‘resulting in greater confidence in the findings’ (Bryman 2016, 386) Additionally, by using the diary entries actively in the interview setting to establish whether or not the entries were a representative snap-shot of the informants regular eating patterns, has worked as a form of ‘member validation’ (Seale 2018, 576). I have also tried to do my utmost to respect the data material and the stories they tell, with methodological rigor and theoretical sensitivity. To not force ‘preordained schemes on the social world’ (Bryman 2016, 383). I have followed Blumer’s plea to treat theoretical concepts as sensitizing devices rather than definitive concepts, allowing the empirical data to dictate the narrative. Accordingly, I have approached the data using practice theory as a ‘toolkit approach’ offering ‘resources for building narratives and for plotting the world’, rather than ‘readymade plots to be stitched upon “phenomena”’ (Nicolini 2012, 218). Through dynamic use of word-for-word transcripts and by incorporating longer sections of my informant’s accounts into the analysis I have made sure the stories of my informants are re-told as they were.

The generalizability of my findings is limited, as with all qualitative research, oriented towards ‘contextual uniqueness’ (Bryman 2016, 384). Hence, I have attempted to provide ‘thick descriptions’ (Bryman 2016, 384) of the research design, the participants and the context to enable readers to make their own judgment about the transferability of the data to other social settings. The purposive and clearly delineated sampling of motivated meat reducers from urban areas improves the potential for other researches to judge the extent of transferability to other contexts (Given 2008).

By providing a detailed account of my methodological procedures I hope to enable the reader to ‘audit’ the research process in order to understand how and why I have reached my
conclusions, and hence judge the dependability of the research. Here it has been particularly important to inform the reader about subsequent changes to the research process following Covid-19, in order to increase dependability.

Although difficult to strip the research of the underling values that first shaped it, I have attempted to actively seek confirmability by making sure my personal biases do not overtly affect the research process, as mentioned in the chapter on positionality.

3.8. Ethical considerations

All my informants received detailed information regarding the project and their rights as research participants upon confirming their participation. Participation was confirmed, formally, by the signing of a written consent form (See appendix 4). Methods used for data collection is in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD), confirmed by their approval.

To ensure confidentiality and anonymity the names of research participants have been anonymized and replaced with pseudonyms. Due to the probing of topics that might disclose delicate information about family members, such as the organization of domestic eating, extra caution has been taken to protect the anonymity of third persons within respondents’ family. Respondents were explicitly asked not to give away names or sensitive information about family members in the consent form. When such information was registered despite the warning, measures were taken to remove it from transcripts or diary-entries. In the final thesis third persons are not mentioned by name.
4. DOING MEAT REDUCTION
In the following three chapters, I present and analyse the empirical findings through a practice theoretical lens. As a reminder, the research asks; how are efforts to reduce meat consumption in Norwegian households enabled or complicated by existing food practices? Chapter 4 explores why and how people perform meat reduction and touch mainly on what enables meat reduced diets. Chapter 5 answers the second sub-chapter by investigating the bodily, social, and material elements that complicate efforts at meat reduction. The last chapter (6) builds on the preceding analysis and presents additional findings to elucidate specific themes that appear central in structuring my informants’ efforts to reduce meat-eating.

4.1. Motivations
The reasoning behind why my informants sought to reduce their consumption of meat can be roughly divided into four themes: 1) for environmental and climate related purposes 2), health benefits, 3) animal welfare, and/or 4) a general aversion towards excessive use of meat. The first two being the most commonly cited reason by far. These categories, at least one to three, largely echo previous research on motivations for reducing meat consumption. (Malek, Umberger, and Goddard 2019, 124, Verain et al. 2015b, 211-212) It is worth noting that across the Norwegian population, health seems to be the biggest motivator for eating less meat (Bugge and Alfnes 2018). These ‘motivations’ were not mutually exclusive; most informants mentioned two or more of these inspirations when talking about why they commenced meat-reduction. Many displayed passionate aversions towards the practices of industrialized food production, and the politics that facilitates such practices. Motivations were also placed in the context of normative understandings shared across the Norwegian society at large; for example, the notion of taking care of one’s body and mental health by ‘eating healthy’ and doing good for the planet by eating more sustainably (Bugge 2019, 502-510). My informants displayed nuanced understanding of a vast range of issue related to meat-production and meat consumption. Sverre was heavily read up on health implications, Egil on agricultural policy, Emma on the carbon footprints of different meat types and Nina on academic perspectives of food behavior in general. All in all, my group of informants can assertively be described as knowledgeable food consumers, motivated to eat less meat. This holds significance for my findings seeing that the lack of motivation or knowledge often are highlighted as key barriers for sustainable ways of consuming, as explained in the introduction. The findings from this study might then call this claim into question while shedding light on additional factors that play a role in meat-reduction beyond mere knowledge and intentions.
4.1.1. Adopting and carrying motivations

Talking about individual motivations or aspirations within a ‘strong’ reading of practice theory may seem somewhat theoretically inconsistent. Indeed, moving beyond the idea that behaviour is driven by individuals’ motivations, needs and wants, practice schemas commonly treat motivation as part of practice, not as part of the individual (See e.g., Shove et al. 2012). As Reckwitz (2016, 120) emphasize:

it is not the individual who comes to the practice with their own ‘psychological’ motivation, but rather the practice itself of which the motivation is already an integral part’ (…) we must leave aside the problematic ‘individualist’ connotation of the term motivation in favour of the praxeological idea of motivations ‘embedded into’ social practice themselves.

This is not to say that individuals do not carry motivations. Indeed, my informants talk about their motivations quite passionately. Following practice theory, I understand these motivations as originating from and moulded by previous engagement in shared practices.

One apparent explanation for why my informants adopts such motivations and pursue meat reduction would be socialization. Indeed, almost all of my meat-reducing informants either have been, or currently are, part of social networks where the notion of meat-reduction seems normalized and is considered an acceptable way to eat or even highly valued. However, they are socialized into such understandings to varying degrees and in various ways. For instance, Mikkel talked about spending half a year studying in Costa Rica where vegetarian eating was largely considered conventional, and Emma discussed her time in a non-profit organization where meat-reduced diets were held by many as an ideal. Others talked about the normalization of meat reduced diets amongst family and friends:

Sigrid: I feel like it's a very established point of view among my friends, to eat less meat, it's more or less a mainstream concept. It's not necessarily a radical change, but rather an ideal to strive for. To think that we shall - and want to - cook more meatless dinners at home. It is something that people are doing and talking about.

A second and linked explanation might concern how non-meat eating is gradually becoming a larger part of the extant environment in which my informants perform eating. As Warde (2016) notes, the social and physical environment people surround themselves with is inscribed with ‘public culture’ that portrays conventional as well as proper ways to eat, ‘a multitude of signs or steering mechanisms to guide practical conduct’ (135). There are many examples of how
non-meat eating is progressively inscribed into the public culture environment as appropriate and valued. Think of the increasing presence of vegetarian and vegan eating online, including recipe suggestions, blogs and meat critical documentaries on popular streaming services, like Netflix (Skreiberg 2018). Not to mention the many opinion pieces and news articles portraying meat eating as undesirable across Norwegian media (See e.g., Knežević 2021, Unneland 2021). Furthermore, many restaurants now offer vegetarian ways of eating, the range and accessibility of products marketed as meat replacements keeps growing (See e.g., Norgesgruppen 2019, Thanem 2019) and dedicated vegetarian or vegan eateries are setting up shop in the bigger cities (Skreiberg 2018). Or think of the social adoption of concepts such as ‘meatless Monday’ (Bugge 2019, 505) or the implementation of vegetarian eating by Norwegian institutions (e.g., Baisotti, Andersen, and Dyrnesli 2019). Following this, it may be that more and more people are inclined to adopt meat reduced ideals and ways of eating, as vegetarian eating is infused into public culture as an increasingly normal and esteemed thing to do:

Sverre: I see it more and more […] that it is becoming increasingly common, and it is reflected in the available alternatives. You can get Beyond Burger (a meat-replacement burger alternative) as an alternative to a beef burger at our local Deli de Luca… in that sense something has happened.

Nina: I do pay attention to what people are talking about (‘the word on the street’) and then I think that it is possible to eat a bit less [meat].

As my interview with Nina highlights and suggests, the increased diffusion of non-meat eating across society with attached social and physical manifestations may shape individual sayings and doings in a subtle, indirect manner. Similar sayings as the one cited above expressed a desire to align performances of eating with the normative idea that eating less meat is a thing one should do. It seems as though the motivation to reduce meat had come about organically, without the need to deliberately engage with or source out specific information. This was also the case for Ylva, who justified meat reduction on the basis that ‘it is in with the times and the people around me, that this is something you do’. Indeed, as argued by Warde (2016, 135):

it would be very odd to consider all [the] publicly and almost universally available information and commentary [on eating] to have no impact upon individual performances, despite it […] not being studied, consciously absorbed or intentionally taken into account by the actor.

A third explanation may consider the influence of general understandings. The ‘projects’ my informants say they pursue, as in ‘doing’ healthy or sustainable eating evidently points to some structuring general understandings ‘out there’ beyond practice-specific teleoaffectivities
(Welch and Warde 2017). Recent research on the values attached to food consumption in Norway shows that an increasing amount of people want to eat healthy and environmentally benign foods (Bugge 2019, 502-510). Health trends in foods seems to connect with the importance given to bodily ideals in the Western world broadly and in Norway more specifically, where foodstuff seems to play an increasingly important role as a tool towards shaping one’s own physique to fit bodily ideals (Bugge 2019, 507). Indeed, some of my informants’ eating practices were largely driven by goals of attaining a healthy body and eating less meat aligned with their understandings of health. The same informants engaged in physical activity for similar reasons. Likewise, the increasing amount of people wanting to eat ethically benign foods seem to be connected to general understandings of doing good for the environment. It might be safe to assume that a general understanding in Norway, shared by many, is that we need to take care of the environment (see Gram-Hanssen 2010, for similar argument in relation to the Danish context). For instance, the result of a recent survey suggested that half of the Norwegian populace are willing to accept the implementation of significantly restrictive political measures – similar to those that were put into place to curb the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic – as a response to the climate crisis (Krekling and Fjeld 2020).

For most of my informants, this commonly shared value structured their doings and sayings beyond eating, relating to other domains of consumption, for example, by buying second-hand clothing or using sustainable modes of transport. These general understandings seem to allow for the uptake of personal eating-projects in the name of health and sustainability. Thus, one might see motivations not merely as practice specific, as suggested above by Reckwitz (2016) but attached to wider general understandings beyond the practice of eating. That is, more general motivations that inform what it makes sense for a person to do across practices; ‘govern[ing] activity by conditioning practical intelligibility or the normative form that practical intelligibility can assume’ (Welch and Warde 2017, 187). However, as we will see later, ascribing importance to general understandings such as ‘health’ when enacting eating, may also complicate the uptake of meat-reduced diets.

4.1.2. Recruited to meat reduction
The three explanations provided above help clarify why my informants have taken on the project of doing meat reduction. Processes of socialization underline the ‘relevance of existing social ties’ in ‘recruiting’ practitioners (Shove et al. 2012, 66–69). The general sense that meat reduction is something one should do emphasizes the power of the social and physical environments in scripting proper ways to act, both explicitly and implicitly. Hence, following
practice theory, we may understand the growing interest in meat-reduced eating across the Norwegian populace (Bugge 2019, 504-506) as the cumulative capturing of cohorts (to specific ways of eating) made possible by the increased diffusion of non-meat eating as valued and normal. The continuing and growing manifestation of meat reduction through people’s actions and through the physical environment increasingly facilitates ‘first encounters’ (Shove et al. 2012, 66–69) and hence recruitment to non-meat eating. The idea of an inducive public cultural environment connects well with Watson’s (2012) claim that if a sufficient amount of people adopts novel ways of doing something, it may create a momentum towards doing things differently. Simply put, the increased normalization of meat reduction seems to play a large part in explaining why my informants ‘do’ meat reduced diets. It is important to note, however, that the normalisation described here applies to an urban, highly educated, typically young, milieu. As hinted to in the methodological chapter, there are good reasons to believe that these influences are highly context-dependent and would not apply to the Norwegian society at large. Indeed, there seems to exist an urban/rural (Aasvang 2020) and generational divide (young/old) (Bugge and Alfnes 2018) in terms of the degree of tolerance towards non-meat eating in Norway.

Individuals embarking upon the project of meat reduction may bring up associations to the rational actor described in the theoretical chapter, one who either seeks to maximize utility or deliberately express identity. However, as I have tried to establish here, following a practice approach, the understanding of meat-reduction as ‘participation in a collective venture […] takes explanatory precedence over personal deliberation and self-determination’ (Warde 2016, 145). As we will see in the preceding analytical chapters, the organization of practice denote and guide the specific forms that the projects of meat reduction may take. Rendering ‘personal evolution or transformation in eating habits […] more a matter of shifting allegiance between already established alternative types of practice than of radical innovation’ (Warde 2016, 145). Having introduced the motivations my informants carry and having contemplated matters of recruitment to meat reduced doings, the next section will turn focus to the varying ways in which meat reduction is approached in everyday life.

### 4.2. Approaches to meat reduction
Before presenting the various ways my informants approach meat reduction, I will make a caveat. The following section focuses explicitly on eating performances dictated by my informants; that is, the food they prepare or buy themselves. Their approach to meat reduction when served meals by others is analysed in the next chapter. It is also important to note that
when interviewing people about meat reduction in regard to meal preparations, people tacitly referred to cooking as cooking up dinner. References made to the preparation of breakfast or lunch were rare. This may be explained by the fact that Norwegians often only eat one meal a day that demands more elaborate cooking. Typically, breakfast and lunch are cold, bread-based, simple servings while dinners are hot, meat-intense, more complex ‘platefuls’ (Holm et al. 2015). Furthermore, less attention was given to reducing meat in the preparation of lunch and breakfast meals, the significance of which will be discussed in chapter 5. Consequently, there is a skewed attention in the following, focusing mainly on meat reduction across more complex, hot meals, i.e., mostly dinner.

My informants approached meat reduction in various ways. Here, my research finds similar patterns to Mylans’s (2018) research on meat reducers in the UK. She highlights three ‘strategies’; 1) people avoid meaty meals 2) people replace meat in conventional meat-based dishes and 3) to decrease the frequency of meat-based dishes, people alter the repertoire of meals that are regularly prepared. When presenting the findings from my research, I base the discussion in a similar typology, but add two additional approaches: 4) frugal meat use and 5) selective meat avoidance. In the following I mainly refer to them as ‘approaches’ rather than ‘strategies’ due to associations of deliberate intention attached to the latter word. Indeed, as will become clearer as this thesis progress, efforts at doing meat reduction rarely presented itself as the execution of carefully deliberated and well-planned individual strategies.

4.2.1. Meat substitution
The first group of approaches revolved around replacing meat from meat-intense dishes. Substituting meat was done by replacing meat with vegetables, legumes, fish or products typically marketed as meat-replacement products, in traditionally meaty dishes. For instance, Mikkel replaced chicken with tofu in a chicken tandoori and cooked up ‘champignon stroganoff’, instead of the more conventional beef stroganoff. Often, straight substitutions were made, say when Sigrid cooked up meat-substitute burgers instead of meat burgers. In other cases, dishes were made without a direct substitution in mind, by simply removing the meat while increasing the use of one or more ingredients considered as basic components of the dish. The range of possible performances of meat substitution is well illustrated in my talk with Sverre:

Question In the past, when you ate more meat, how would you put together a meal?
Overall, replacing meat with fish, legumes or vegetables came of as more popular ways of doing meat reduction, compared to that of commercial meat-replacement products.

The notion of substitution was perhaps made most evident when my informants recollected piecing together non-meaty dishes by *thinking with meat*:

**Sverre:** I would probably cook a steak and fry some vegetables … so it is not a huge change, because I ate a lot of it already. I haven’t changed very much. It was easy because I’ve always enjoyed vegetables. In a way, I have only removed one part and maybe added some broccoli … Alternatively [I] make a vegetarian burger or plant-based burger myself, or maybe I buy something; whether it's a 'Beyond Burger' or something like that […] but then again, often times I’ve just removed a piece of meat and replaced it with more broccoli and tomato.

**Mikkel:** A dinner always contains a portion of meat, that’s just how it’s meant to be, then maybe some vegetables and some carbohydrates. Its noticeable in the way I cook food: the piece of meat is always ‘there’, even when it is replaced with beans, the meat element is always a part of the diet.

Thinking that meat needs some sort of replacement when removed seems connected to shared understandings of a proper meal. When talking about a proper dinner many of my informants drew on similar understandings. As illustrated in the above excerpt, they commonly divided their meal into three main components: starch/carbs, vegetables and meat/protein, resembling plate model thinking, (i.e., ‘tallerkenmoddelen’). These understandings may partly reflect purposeful and intended regulation of eating. This way of putting together meals has been endorsed through government recommendations on healthy eating (Helsedirektoratet 2018) and primary school curriculum (Hårberg 2018). Often meat or fish are portrayed as a central component, making up 1/3 of the total plate; sometimes referred to as the protein dense part. Slightly different versions of this plate-model understandings were carried by most of my informants. For instance, Egil talked about ‘vegetables, carbs and meat or fish’, while Sigrid; referred to; ‘vegetables, a form of protein; maybe lentils or beans […] and some carbs’. Thinking in terms of the plate model seems, to some degree, embodied in all informants’ practical sense, and this model dictated how meat-free meals were constructed when dishes where rearranged.

---

8 ‘Tallerkenmoddelen’ is a pedagogical tool/model used to communicate dietary recommendations, more specifically the composition of a nutritious dinner. Here, the meal is divided into three parts; carbohydrates, vegetables and meat/fish (Bugge 2005, 157)
4.2.2. Avoiding meat-based dishes
The second category of approaches was related to avoiding meat-based dishes. This approach emerged as a distinct way of thinking in terms of fixed and meat dependent dishes. The components that together constituted a specific dish were understood as unreplaceable, meaning that meat avoidance equaled dish avoidance. Different from the abovementioned approach, was that people were thinking in terms of avoiding certain dishes, rather than substituting components of the dish.

This would entail cooking up vegetarian or fish-based dishes instead of meat-based ones. Not surprisingly, this approach was popular when eating out, where menus come with a pre-defined, fixed, set of dishes. Avoiding meat was considered easy because vegetarian or fish-based eating was made tasty. At ‘Peppes’ [pizza restaurant], for instance, there’s no need to order anything with meat, because they sell really tasty vegetarian pizzas (Anna). For some, the notion that vegetarian dishes were readily available across menus enabled meat reduced eating within instances of eating out or ordering in. As Aurora noted; ‘it is easy to order something without meat when eating out, because it all tastes good anyway’. Eating out also allowed people to perform meat reduction in novel ways, enabling eating foods they normally would not have the competence to prepare by themselves. For instance, Aurora would not prepare tofu at home, but order dishes with tofu when eating out.

Furthermore, avoiding meaty meals could also entail avoiding specific meat-intensive practices. In a material context of typically meaty, fast-food menus (Bugge 2015, 92), several informants talked about deliberatively attempting to cut back on instances of eating on the go to avoid meaty habits; ‘In the past, I often bought a sausage at gas-stations and such, but I have become better at avoiding it. I don’t do that anymore’ (Egil).

4.2.3. Managing repertoire
Third, and intimately connected to the second approach, was changing the repertoire of dishes that was frequently prepared, by increasing the frequency of non-meat dishes. This way of reducing meat consumption was often nested in ideas about having a set repertoire of dishes that was frequently repeated. Related ways of doing meat reduction involved decreasing the frequency of meaty dishes, by increasing the frequency of familiar fish-based or vegetarian dishes, or by expanding one’s repertoire through the learning of new dishes. For instance, Nina had recently made an attempt to reduce her frequency of meat-based dinners, by increasing the frequency of fish-based meals in the course of a week:
Nina: Typically, I will maybe have meat five days a week [for dinner], some fish and something else, like pasta. [...] What I wanted to try was to cook up a variety of fish meals, to see how it would be to eat less meat in the course of a week.

Some informants also intentionally learned new non-meat dishes as an approach to engage in meat-reduction, a sort of ‘purposeful training of the body’ (Warde 2016, 130 - 134). Mikkel, attempting meat reduction for the second time in his life, attributed his current capacity to sustain a meat-reduced diet to his increased repertoire of vegetarian cooking.

Mikkel I thought I had to learn some new dishes too. Maybe to make it more interesting. If I remember correctly, I tried to understand what I was doing wrong the last time, because last time I only replaced the meat and continued to eat the same food. Removed the meat and tried to add something else. And, for instance, with pasta I would remove the meat and just eat pasta, ketchup and cheese.

Question ‘what I was doing wrong’ – what do you mean by that?

Mikkel There was no variety in the meals. The meals weren’t nutritious. The meals were quite boring ... and I think that was probably what made me go back to eating meat again [...]

However, with the exception of Mikkel and Egil, my informants rarely learned or made completely new dishes. Rather, they commonly avoided meat-intensive meals by increasing the repertoire of familiar non-meat dishes.

4.2.4. Frugal and resourceful use of meat
My informants also engaged in frugal and resourceful use of meat. The most popular approach related to frugality was reducing the amount of meat in a given dish:

Question So, you eat less meat per dish?

Aurora Yes [...] Typically you would use a pack of minced meat, or two, if there are several people. Just split it in half and add something else. It feels very satisfying, because then I know that this ‘piece of meat’ is enough for two dinners, and not one. Then you have halved your meat consumption, so I like this approach very much.

Several of my informants did as Aurora, effectively moderating their meat intake by decreasing the meat ration across a variety of typically meat-based dishes. For Nina, however, the idea of frugality was taken a step further than most of my other informants. Essential to her motivation of doing meat reduction was the dislike towards wasteful cooking and the opinion that one should utilize every part of the animal. These understandings were reflected in various doings, say, how she stored animal-blood in the freezer for the making of black pudding (‘blodpudding’) and used pork hocks (‘svineknoker’) as flavoring agents in soups.
4.2.5. Selective meat avoidance

The fifth and least used approach was trying to avoid particular types of meat. This was typically either connected to health issues, say, trying to avoid processed meat, or to sustainability concerns, e.g., avoiding animals with larger environmental footprints, such as cattle. For instance, Egil made an effort to buy what he deemed as more sustainable meats, e.g. grass feed beef, which aligned with his understanding of soy-feed livestock as environmentally problematic.

Egil: I'm not anti-meat, but it's not necessary to eat meat seven days a week. It is possible to have two thoughts in your head simultaneously (å ha to tanker I hode på en gang). I allow myself to eat meat, but when I do so, it should be proper meat. I don’t care much for bad meat. You see, I'm not against meat […] I am just a bit annoyed at that soy stuff [referring to soy-feed livestock] that's what really annoys me.

The five approaches listed above were not mutually exclusive and most often used in conjunction. This overlap of approaches was exemplified by Mikkel who drew on a combination of strategy one and two.

Question: Did you mostly change up familiar dishes, or mainly learn new dishes to eat vegetarian?

Mikkel: It’s a good mix. I have my regular go-to dishes where I’ve just replaced the meat […] I’ve also made a lot of new dishes which I have never made before, such as lentil meatballs with couscous salad and stuff like that.

Furthermore, people did not directly talk in the terms of specific approaches or have a clear separation between them. Rather, they were heavily mixed together. There were also multiple examples of crossovers and combinations of approaches inside the confines of one meal. For instance, Sigrid reduced the amount of minced meat used in tacos by substituting parts of it with beans, thus engaging in meat substitution (approach 1) as a means of frugality (approach 4).

Interviewees relied unevenly on these different strategies. For some, substituting meat within a single meal or dish was heavily used, while others relied more on avoiding meat-intensive dishes altogether. Additionally, the different strategies were pursued differently. Some avoided meat-intensive dishes by cooking up vegetarian dishes, while others upped the frequency of fish-based dishes. Some engaged in substitution using meat-replacement products, while others substituted with legumes.

One way to comprehend why my informants approach meat reduction differently, is to recognize the workings of their dispositions; how ways of doing and understanding eating,
learned from previous enactments of eating, guide the implementation of meat reduction. To reiterate, people acquire a set of procedures through previous engagement in practice, sedimented as dispositions, which guide what it makes sense for them to do in future situations (Warde 2016, 146). In the following, I zoom in on two examples to illustrate how dispositions both open up and limit possible paths of meat reduction, to explain why different people do meat reduction differently and in particular ways.

4.3. Doing it differently: dispositioned performances of meat reduction

My informant Nina, a 76-year-old retired food researcher, carried particular food related sayings and doings adopted through past experience and purposive training. Through her education at ‘husmorskolen’ (an education in domestic subjects such as housekeeping and food preparation), other forms of purposive training (e.g. food conservation classes) and practical experience (e.g. engaging in Facebook groups on ‘traditional foods’, as well as being forced to cook from an early age), she had adopted particular understanding and skills, unique amongst my group of informants. At ‘husmorskolen’ she learned how to cook everything from scratch, using fresh produce to prepare ‘traditional foods’ (‘tradisjonskost’) and to exploit every part of the animal (‘bruke hele dyret’). Equally important, through our interview she displayed the embodiment of understandings, meanings and values attached to these ways of cooking, appreciating moderation over excess, traditional, homemade foods over ‘fancy’ gourmet meals and fresh produce instead of processed foods. For instance, when asked about why she did not use meat-replacement products, Nina passionately replied:

Nina: why bother tamper with things when you can use conventional pure ingredients? Many young people know very little about cooking and do not realize it is almost as easy to do it [meat substitution] with pure ingredients, which is what I have tried […]

These embodied understandings and doings seem to be significant in understanding Nina's ways of doing meat reduction. Nina mainly followed two specific approaches: (1) eating more fish-based dishes and (2) engaging in different forms of frugal meat use. As noted under approach four in the above, Nina’s frugal ways of using meat involved ‘utilizing the whole animal’, making sure nothing eatable was wasted. She was also preoccupied with the idea of eating less meat per serving by dividing larger chunks of meat across the week:

Question How do you approach meat reduction?
Nina: When we buy a steak and are only two people […] we eat roast the first day, cold roast the next, use it over many days, and end up using it as cold cuts […] we cut it up and have it in salad, or we have it in soup, or we have it on a slice of bread, and so the servings are made smaller.

When asked about how long she had performed these frugal ways of cooking, or where she learned to do so, Nina pointed out: ‘this is knowledge [adopted] from husmorskolen’.

Through my interview with Nina a skepticism towards cooking vegetarian meals became evident. Particularly so when asked hypotheticals of serving or cooking up specific dishes without meat. Aligned with ABC-model thinking one could explain the decision to not cook non-meat dishes as a result of not intending to adopt vegetarian ways of eating. She only ‘wants’ or ‘seeks’ to eat less, which she manages to do in terms of engaging in frugality. A practice perspective might provide a more nuanced explanation to why vegetarian eating is not pursued. It is possible to interpret this reluctance towards non-meat servings as her dispositioned understanding and taste restraining her from doing differently. As we s Indeed, Nina’s acquired understandings of proper cooking were more or less dependent on meat or fish to be included in some shape or form. Assembling a dinner without it seemed unthinkable. Indeed, the thought of purposefully cooking vegetarian dishes seemed distant to Nina. Despite implicitly admitting to doing vegetarian cooking - say, when cooking up pancakes or porridge - she did not explicitly cook vegetarian dishes for the sake of doing meat reduction. Indeed, such dishes were not referred to as vegetarian options or as a deliberative attempt at eating vegetarian. Instead, representing rather conventional Norwegian foods, the serving of porridge and pancakes seemed to follow her embodied understandings and taste for traditional, homemade cooking and dishes. Nina was the only one of my informants who did not have a close social network where vegetarian eating was normalized or accepted, and hence, she seems to lack the vocabulary (sayings) and necessary understandings to enact meat reduction through vegetarian eating. This may help explain why Nina performed meat reduction by either reducing the amount of meat in a dish or increasing the eating of fish-based meals, as noted above.

Emma, a 27 year old jurist from Oslo, carried rather different dispositions than Nina. Growing up with socially engaged (‘samfunnsengasjerte’) parents and partaking in the environmental movement from the age of 14, Emma was socialized early into ways of eating that did not necessarily depend on meat or fish. She described her late teen eating habits as pescatarian –albeit not with that exact word. The implementation of a pescatarian diet was recalled as one of following normative ways of eating, widely embraced by her peers:
Emma: It (eating pescatarian) was pretty easy because I was a part of a milieu where it was perfectly acceptable - where it was more or less the norm […] at least half of the participants at the Nature and Youth (Natur og Ungdom) events were vegetarians, it was completely accepted. Also, a lot of my friends were vegans.

Later in life, Emma describes her diet as ‘fluid’, shifting between vegetarian, pescatarian, flexitarian, to meat eating and meat reduced eating. For instance, in stark contrast to her pescatarian period of eating, she consumed a substantial amount of meat across the span of 3-4-year relationship with a meat-eater. Nowadays, Emma’s diet does include meat. However, in contrast to Nina, she carries a wider more flexible understanding of proper eating, which may be credited to the exposure to a variety of ‘proper’ ways to eat through her upbringing, including her teenage years as well as early adulthood. A proper meal for Emma was not defined by the inclusion of animal flesh. Her omnivorous dispositioned tastes allow meat reduction to be approached in various ways; by eating fish-based, vegetarian or strictly plant-based meals. Emma commenced meat reduction by combining several, if not all the approaches defined above, including selective meat avoidance, an approach she embodied from partaking in the environmental movement:

Emma: to eat Norwegian sheep, for instance, is something I have been indoctrinated with from the environmental movement – less emissions and good for maintaining the cultural landscape, so it is smart to eat both for climate related purposes and for the management of nature. Sometimes I might buy a hen at the store, instead of a chicken, to, say, make a chicken fricassee, and sometimes I might also eat whale meat, also for climate related reasons. Additionally, I believe that it’s good to harvest from nature’s resources – I’m a bit pragmatic in that sense.

Introducing and contrasting Nina’s and Emma’s stories helps illustrate how a dispositioned practical sense simultaneously allow and limit possible paths of meat reduction. While Emma’s omnivorous tastes seem to allow for a wide range of ways to perform meat reduction, Nina’s tastes seem to be more restricting in terms of affording possible ways of doing meat reduction, one that is dependent on the frequent use of animal flesh. In relation to my sample, their tastes can be said to illustrate two opposites on a continuum, ranging from more meat and fish dependent to less. Most of my informants shared Emma’s omnivorous tastes that allows for both vegetarian- and meat-based eating. This is worth noting because the interviews and diaries suggest that the informants who displayed most scepticism towards vegetarian eating, i.e., Egil and Nina, carried the more meat-intense diets.
Furthermore, these dispositioned tastes are relevant because they represent each their specific set of shared understandings that can be traced back to the general population. Results from a recent surveys on the Norwegian populace indicate that approximately half of the population, similar to Nina, consider meat or fish to be integral to a tasty, healthy, nutritious, complete and filling dinner (Bugge and Alfnes 2018, 79). Emma’s omnivorous taste, on the other hand, seems to fit well with the increasing part of the population, particularly younger, that exemplify tolerance for vegetarian eating (Bugge and Alfnes 2018). Hence, their stories may be valuable in order to better appreciate how certain understandings that pertain to the shared practice of eating across Norway may enable or restrict ways of doing meat reduction.

4.4. Relying on familiarity: small adjustments rather than drastic change
A practice perspective illuminates a particular understanding of the inclination to repeat past performances of eating, one that appreciate the bounded qualities of practical sense, habituation and the significance of mundane effectiveness in the management of everyday life (Warde 2016). As the discussion above illustrate, my informants approached meat reduction in different ways, guided by their dispositioned practical sense. What also became evident was the ways in which all informants most frequently relied on familiar patterns of eating when performing meat reduction. As illustrated in the above, these included but were not limited to introducing new elements to familiar dishes in order to replace meat, reduce the amount of meat in acquainted dishes or rely more heavily on other well-known fish-based or vegetarian dishes. Respondents rarely engaged in the learning of new dishes or constructed meals in unfamiliar ways. Hence, changes made to moderate meat eating were typically of small adjustments rather than radical change. O’Neill et al. (2019) report similar findings from researching the changing of people’s food practices in relation to moments of ‘fractures’ e.g., having children or going into retirement. The subsequent change in people’s ways of eating was far from radical, ‘but represented incremental changes that broadly conformed to previous ‘usual’ ways of performing food’ (228).

4.4.1. Meat reduction as bounded creativity
The above discussion illustrates how meat-reduction takes place inside a confined space of thinking and doing. Thinking seemed restrained in terms of understandings of ‘proper’ meals exemplified by plate model thinking or fixed dishes (understood as a static structure of
components) and limited in the sense of doing by available bodily procedures (dishes + dish-repertoire), further elaborated below.

Ways of doing meat reduction were often tacitly structured by ideas of what a meal should and should not look like as well as the available bodily procedures people had at hand in terms of dishes or cooking skills. When people substitute meat with legumes or reduce the amount of meat in a dish, people display creativity within familiar ways of cooking; hence, poiesis and boundedness are simultaneously at play (Nicolin 2012). For instance, many of my informants carry the idea that meat might be replaced - but only by particular foodstuff with specific qualities, often understood as protein dense foods. Some, although few, may even create new dishes like, ‘fish-finger-tacos’ (Emma), by arranging components in innovative ways. However, eating is still not entirely re-invented. When Emma ‘renews’ tacos, she does so inside a familiar assemblage of components; a basic ‘taco-structure’ made of meat/fish/beans, served with different toppings, wrapped in a tortilla, using an alternative yet familiar foodstuff (fish-fingers). Hence, even the most innovative cooking still follows familiar structures and use familiar foodstuff. Indeed, as noted by Warde (2016), ‘changed habits must always be a process of modification, for it is impossible to engage in eating completely afresh’ (145). In other words, peoples’ ingenuity is bounded by embodied procedures and understandings. Bounded by understandings of proper cooking (elemental approach, building the meal around the meat/protein, healthy cooking), the material goods available (often familiar ingredients habitually picked up at the grocery store), competence (which ingredients go together, how to arrange them into a meaningful whole) teleoaffectivities (what kind of cooking are more or less appropriate to which occasion). Even on the rare occasion of learning new dishes, these also follow set structures and prescribe specific acceptable ways of putting together a meal. These ways of doing meal preparations, are normalized doings, learned through practical experience, socialization or the use of recipes, carrying pre-defined understanding of what it means to eat ‘properly’. Hence, I interpret my informants’ meat reduction projects as performances of ‘bounded creativity’ (Nicolini 2012, 225-226). Furthermore, while the unique character of the dispositioned practical sense helps explain why people approach meat reduction in specific ways, it also suggests a certain boundedness to how it may be done. And so, accustomed ways of cooking are tacitly reproduced because ‘the sense established by the practice is a horizon which prevents [them] from seeing things differently’ (Nicolini 2012, 226).
4.4.2. Convenient routines of mundane effectiveness

To fully grasp the significance of meat reduction inside familiar ways of eating, particularly the significance of the third approach (managing repertoire), it might be useful to take a step back and establish the social and practical significance of dish repertoire and habituated meal engagements in everyday life. In the same way that Warde (2016) describes practical sense as ‘having at one's command suites of procedures, sanctioned by and vouched for by a collectively maintained Practice, which require no reflection about their implementation in situ’ (126), my informants displayed a command of - or more precisely, a repertoire of - dishes. These were understood to be convenient, time-efficient and suitable performances of eating. They were previously vouched for by family members and their implementation required little time, mental or physical capacity by virtue of already knowing how to perform them by heart. Hence, they were frequently prepared with little deliberation.

Aurora: we have very few dishes – ten dishes – to choose from […] they (the kids) always want to eat spaghetti bolognese, so we could serve it three times a week, it would have been very easy, it takes ten minutes to prepare.

Anna: It's not like I have to think a lot about what they [the children] like and what they do not like, […] I want to make it easy for myself, so I choose something I know they love and are familiar with, and something that takes a short time to prepare; fish-sticks for example.

In order to effectively implement appropriate eating performances in a temporally restricted everyday life, my informants relied heavily on their personal repertoire of these dishes:

Sigrid: We have a repertoire that repeats and endures (som durer og går) […] we make the same things all the time, it will take some effort to do things differently

Ylva: I think we have a fairly limited repertoire of dinner dishes. It would have been obvious if the diary covered more than one week, then you would have seen that there were many of the same dishes […] I think we run through [all the dishes] during a two or three-week cycle. I do not think I have a lot of dishes; pasta with tomato sauce, pasta carbonara, fish sticks with something on the side, salmon fillet with something on the side, pancakes, pizza […]

The heavy repetition of familiar dishes and reliance on dish repertoire might be interpreted as a way in which people are ‘practically negotiating multiple pressures of everyday life, through reliance on habit’ (Mylan 2018, 8). It seems to make sense for my informants to reproduce familiar ways of cooking because they ensure ‘mundane effectiveness’ (Warde 2016, 126). By virtue of being repeated over time and thus habituated, familiar dishes save mental capacity and time. Also, through previously repeated execution across different contexts, their social
appropriateness is already vouched for, and hence, eating may commence without large bouts of reflection about its implementation in situ (Warde 2016, 126). The convenience afforded by repeating a familiar repertoire of dishes may also explain why most of informants rarely engage in the making of entirely new dishes. The time investment needed – finding a suitable recipe aligned with the preferences and needs of fellow diners, sourcing out unfamiliar ingredients, piecing together a meal by carefully following step-by-step instructions – and the social uncertainty associated with the making of a new dish; will it be accepted by the kids, or by the spouse? - renders its performance less practicable and hence less sensible.

This argument is strengthened when looking closer at the two informants that engaged most frequently in the learning of new dishes. Being single, Mikkel mostly performed solo eating, which seems to have allowed him a space for testing and failing. In the absence of temporal and social pressures of family life, everyday life was indeed less reliant on convenient, socially pre-approved modes of eating. For Egil, a retired man in his 60s, the hectic family life with young kids and the repetitious preparation of convenient foods to fit temporal and social pressures was now a distant memory. Free from the temporal and social pressures of managing a hectic family life, Egil nowadays often engaged in time-consuming cooking, which occasionally involved the adoption of new recipes.

4.5. Closing remarks
In this chapter I have described the motivations and approaches of my respondents. The picture painted is one of recruitment to a collective undertaking rather than rational actors engaging in meat reduction based on private motives. Although drawing on similar approaches, meat reduction is pursued differently across respondents. Somewhat uniquely, dispositioned bodies explain how people engage in meat reduction differently and apply specific approaches in line with embodied procedures and understandings. Following this, I have suggested that we may understand meat reduction as ‘bounded creativity’ (Nicolini 2012), in that people’s practical sense, navigated by dispositions, permit ingenuity but also limits possible ways of doing and thinking. This sense of bounded creativity goes some way to explain why my informants commonly engage in familiar ways of eating to commence meat reduction. Additionally, it seems to make sense for people to reproduce, i.e., hold onto, tried and tested performances of meal preparation, because they offer convenience, stability and certainty in the management of everyday life. The mundane effectiveness afforded by habituated meal preparation seem to increase the dependence on acquainted doings, making novel ways, like learning new dishes, less do-able.
Hence, the discussion ascribes particular importance to processes of socialization in enabling meat reduction and the shape it may take. First, socialization seem to play an important role in recruiting people to meat reducing ways. Second, performances of meat reduction are guided by the socialized body, carrying learned procedures and understandings. The broader significance of socialization in both enabling and complicating meat reduced diets will be elucidated in the following analytical chapters.

As we have seen in the above, individual bodies and the knowledge they carry often impede the total reinvention of eating allowing only for the performance of meat reduction as bounded creativity. The competences of my informants, alone, however, do not determine the possible ‘success’ of meat-reduction in terms of being able to decrease the actual amount of meat consumed. This, as we will see in the next chapter, is determined by the coming together of the dispositioned body and the extant practice(s) in which it partakes (Schatzki 2002)
5. COMPLICATING MEAT REDUCTION

As explained in the theoretical chapter, understanding the social world as made up of practices emphasize the notion that agency is distributed between the body, material- and social context (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014, Wilhite 2012). It is important to underline the interdependencies of these three elements. In complex ways they shape and constitute one another. The body is a ‘repository of past experiences’ (Wilhite 2016, 28); behaviour, cognitive as well as physical, learned through engaging with different materials and in specific social settings, which sediments as dispositions for future action. To paraphrase Schatzki (2002), it is only in the minds of dispositioned human actors that an action makes sense (75). People know how to cook dinner, in the normative sense, without deliberative thought. The material world gives attention to the agentic capacity of the things we surround ourselves with, that carry – to some extent – inducive ‘scripts’ (Verbeek 2006) of proper conduct, which was once more or less purposefully engineered into technologies and infrastructures, in a specific social context by dispositioned human bodies. Taken for granted assumptions about domestic eating is continuously built into the physical environment; freezers and ovens have become a default in every Western kitchen, because ‘we must’ be able to freeze and heat our foods. The social dimension assigns agency to social conventions and standards, which in turn are scripted into the physical environment that surrounds us (Warde 2016) and the tools we use (Verbeek 2006), and which is also embodied in human actors. Doing parenting may involve the synchronization of feeding children with normative ideas about time-squeezing, inscribed in and facilitated by microwaves and convenience food (Jackson and Viehoff 2016), and habitually performed by human bodies. Indeed, the ‘pillars’ of practice (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014) are always simultaneously at work.

In this chapter, I will use these elements to structure the presentation and analysis of my findings. However, as pointed out in theoretical chapter, this division is not made as a re-entering of individualism, treating social norms and material environment simply as external barriers to that of performing meat reduction. Their separation is of structural intent, to provide analytical ease and clarity. One of the most central affordances of practice theory, as I see it, is to conceptualize material, social and bodily elements as interdependent. It is this very complexity that calls for analytical clarity.

This chapter zoom in on the three pillars of practice, respectively, to illustrate what and how specific elements complicate my informants’ attempts at doing meat reduction. However, I do not make an absolute separation of them, I link up elements where I find it suitable for the purpose of describing and analysing the findings. After doing so, I zoom out to give an example
of how the multifaceted assembly of agentic qualifiers together may render meat reduction difficult. I illustrate how the interdependence of said elements together qualify the ‘do-abilities’ (Halkier 2010) of meat reduction in specific circumstances. The discussion also emphasizes ‘the effects brought to bear by the associations between practices’ (Nicolini 2012, 232), which often involve contradictory logics. I here take inspiration from Nicolini (2012), in focusing on ‘the types of opportunities for action that association between practices conjures for those who live at their intersection’ (232).

5.1. Meat accustomed bodies

As Warde (2014, 287) has noted; ‘eating recommends itself as a mundane and routinised activity, which is founded in bodily habits and learned taste, of both sensual and social type’. It follows then that to understand why people consume the foodstuffs they do, we need to acknowledge the full spectrum of ‘embodied knowledge’ (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014, 29). This includes corporal routines, particularly the knee-jerk or mindless behaviour often identified as habit (Warde 2016), dispositioned opinions and beliefs (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014, 29), and learned sensual preferences. As introduced in the theoretical chapter, body-minds are shaped through previous engagement in practice and carry learned ways of doing and thinking. Hence, ‘the body is thus not only the site of action, but also of dispositions for future actions’ (Wilhite 2016, 29). The notion of meat reduction as bounded creativity, established in chapter 4, rests on this assumption. Bourdieu, for instance, attached much power to publicly acquired ways of eating in creating dispositions for future action when saying that; ‘it is probably in tastes of food that one would find the strongest and most indelible mark of infant learning, the lessons which longest withstand the distancing or collapse of the native world and most durably maintain nostalgia for it’ (Bourdieu 1984, 71). In this subchapter we will see how previous habituation of meaty ways of eating carry agency though the body in the shape of habits and dispositioned understandings which complicates meat avoidance.

5.1.1. Embodied tastes, understandings and competence complicating meat reduction

People’s practical sense does not only make specific ways of doing meat reduction more or less feasible, as we saw in the previous chapter, but it also complicates meat reduction in various ways. Tacit understandings related to proper eating and cooking were well established in the previous chapter, for instance as illustrated by plate-model thinking. Similarly, my informants
carried a sense that meat belonged to specific occasions or servings. Emma explicitly stated that escaping meat was often difficult due to a ‘default mindset’ that some dishes had to include meat, as if their existence were dependent on it. Similarly, others tacitly referred to specific dishes such as lasagna or other types of pasta dishes as meaty by default, without entertaining the thought that they might be made vegetarian. Mikkel talked about continuing to eat meat ‘where it belongs’, referring to meals of particular social significance, such as at New Years Eve. Interestingly, the teleo-affectivities of celebrating Christmas seem to demand meat-intense performances of eating. This was unanimously accepted as the proper way to do Christmas across my sample, and simply not up for negotiation. The most eager meat-reducers would still continue to eat meat at Christmas, while the less eager meat-reducers chuckled when presented with the idea of eating vegetarian for Christmas:

Egil  No, that’s just nonsense, damn it. On Christmas Eve, we have lamb ribs, the first day of Christmas we have self-shot pork ribs, and then we eat lutefisk. That is Christmas food.

Question: Why do you think it’s especially difficult to avoid meat during Christmas?

Egil  First of all, the Christmas food - the lamb ribs – it tastes damn good when you eat it once a year. It’s the only time you eat it. It’s also tradition. My daughter says that “it’s Christmas” when the house smells of cooked lamb ribs.

Various reflections around meat as essential, or at least beneficial, for providing health and vigor also complicated the possibilities for reduction. This was typically coupled with worries about not having the necessary competence to stay healthy on a diet low in meat;

Mikkel  It’s simply due to the fact that I do not have the sufficient knowledge about what I should eat to get all the right nutrients […] you don’t get iron on a vegetarian diet, if I remember correctly. So… I sometimes eat liver-pate for breakfast to ensure that I consume iron. Also, my sister has iron deficiency, so I'm worried that I might be in the same risk group.

This was particularly the case in the context of caring for children. For some informants, a meat-free diet was assumed to be deficient when it came to maintaining the health of children. Others did not necessarily suppose vegetarian eating to be lacking, but blamed their own lack of nutritional competence to ensure healthy non-meat eating for their kids. Either way, meat was largely resorted to as a way to guarantee the health of kids. For Anna, including meat in her kid’s diets was a way to safeguard a balanced diet:

Anna:  For me - who has no idea of how to put together a balanced diet - I think it's an easy way to get a lot [of nutrients] at once. I do not know enough about nutrition to feel confident
that I… alone would manage to put together a balanced diet for the children […], would the children, who is developing, get everything they need if they did not eat any meat – I just don’t know enough to dare to do it […].

Indeed, for some, the uncertainty associated to abandoning meat from their kids diet, and the self-described lack of competence in serving kids a full-fledged and appropriate non-meat diet, inhibited them from doing so.

Moreover, some of my informants seems to be drawn to meat because it fulfilled bodily, sensual, cravings. Indeed, many of my informants recalled the physical sensation of meat as a justification for continuing to eat meat; a taste non-meat-alternatives could not match. It seems that such cravings were cued by specific environmental settings as well as temporal prompts. For instance, Sigrid situated the bodily craving for meats to evening meals, while Emma drew an association to specific restaurant experiences:

Sigrid
[I]n the evening, if I eat a late meal, I often feel like eating some meat… something salty, cured ham. It is this salty taste that seems difficult to replace… the specific salty taste. So in the evenings I may eat some cold meats.

Emma
If I buy wok for example, or Asian food, I sometimes buy tofu-based and sometimes something with meat. It varies a bit really, based on what I feel like. Or if I'm at Mamma Pizza (local pizza restaurant) I buy… for instance a very good tasting ragù or pasta with meat sauce. That one is very tasty. I am very fond of that dish.

Some dispositions towards certain flavours were more tacitly performed, made apparent by justifications such as ‘I just felt like eating it, because it tastes good’. Emma’s account above also ties positive emotions to the eating of a specific meaty dish. Sometimes, a desire for the taste of meat took precedence over the ‘want’ to reduce meat consumption; as Sigrid said: ‘it feels like [the eating of meat] is a bit emotionally driven, driven by desire. Occasionally, the desire has trumped the principles’.

Most importantly, however, many of the internal negotiations that play out involved the subject of flavour. Respondents often negotiated performing meat-reduction as a trade-off between meat avoidance and the comfort and pleasure of eating tasty meals. As we will see later, this makes avoiding meat particularly difficult across practices where the physical sensation of taste is given particular significance, like that of eating out. On the flip side, some forms of non-meat eating were enabled when made appetizing, for instance when people order non-meat meals when eating out because of taste, as noted in chapter 4.
5.1.2. Eating in a state of distraction

In describing the notion that a considerable amount of eating behaviour is ‘outside, or only at the verges of, the boundaries of deliberate, rational or prospective thought’ Warde notes that mostly ‘we eat in a state of distraction’ (2016, 102). The many tacit and mindless food dealings my informants engage with in everyday life sustains this notion. Indeed, for all of them, most eating practices are retold as routine activities requiring little thought. Eating seemed heavily structured by habituated ways of shopping and cooking. My informants sourced familiar ingredients without much reflexivity or the use of detailed and pre-planned grocery lists. They claimed proficiency in cooking up meals without relying on recipes or bouts of reflexive thinking, suggesting high levels of embodiment. Judging from my informant’s recollections of doing their shopping and cooking, habituated, routine ways of thinking about and doing eating seem to carry great significance. This is evident when considering what ultimately ended up in their shopping-cart, or what was cooked, painting a different picture compared to deliberate strategies to align purchases with wants or intentions, say, those connected to that of meat-reduction. Indeed, mundane food preparation seemed highly habituated; as Ylva noted; ‘you often end up shopping the same things you usually shop and therefore you also have to make the same things as you usually make’. When performing shopping practices, mundane accounts of restocking regularly used foods were recalled, affirmed by sayings such as ‘often I just know what to get […] because something is empty, or we are missing some stuff” (Sverre). This suggests that people carry a tacit sense of what they need, as if there was a fixed set of foodstuffs that required restocking when empty, further implying a habit of repeated purchases. Findings from the literature confirm that Norwegian eating practitioners often engage in repetitious purchasing of foodstuff. For instance, in a study from 2015, only three out of ten admitted to buying something new the last time they went grocery shopping (Kjuus and Flaaten 2015: 38). Furthermore, as touched upon in chapter 4, in preparation of different meals, respondents seemed to rely heavily on a habituated repertoire of dishes and meals. Breakfast, particularly on weekdays, typically constituted the most habitual and tacit form of food engagements, with the same dish repeated up to five or six times in the course of a week. Dinner-dishes were also mentioned as repeated on rotation, but not as frequently as breakfast dishes. Dishes repeated weekly appeared common. In terms of preparing dinner, my informants seem to rely heavily on a collection of dishes, often including meat dependent plates:

Aurora: It kind of just runs automatically (det går jo på automatikk på en måte da). I don’t think very actively about it, but we have, say, ten dishes that we alternate between, of which
three are meaty dishes; meatballs, pizza and spaghetti bolognese […] oh, and sausages […] so four. It's not like we invent the wheel every week, it is what it is.

The description above suggests that people often routinely and tactility buy and prepare the same foods. Many of these routinised ways of eating were meat-dependent and breaking away from them proved to be a challenge for my meat-reducing informants. The reasons why this is the case are multifaceted and will be elaborated on as this chapter progress. In this sub-chapter I begin by unpacking the corporal explanations.

5.1.2.1. Consuming meat in a state of distraction
Following the notion that most of my informants eat in a distracted state, the findings suggest that meat-eating, despite understood as problematic, might stay relatively hidden from view or go unchecked. The observation that my informants voiced surprise over the amount of meat they consumed (amounts which they thought to be lower), as a consequence of taking the time to reflect on and to track their eating through diary entries, implies that some meat-eating goes under the radar of conscious thought. Also, contradictions in what people said they intended to do to reduce meat consumption and what they actually did may suggest the strong hold of habits or the prevalence of mindless or unnoticed meat-doings. For instance, comparing my informant’s sayings with their diary entries revealed some inconsistencies. For example, this was the case with Egil who explained how he had stopped eating on the go to avoid a meat inducive ‘material foodscape’ (Winson 2004) to which the practice was bound. However, his diary proved otherwise, describing two instances of such performances in the course of one week. This may simply suggest a recollection bias or the twisting of truth, i.e. methodological issues. Yet, it may also suggest deeply ingrained and habit-like behaviour, more or less automatically instigated by cues in the environment. A performance so habituated it may be reproduced without much awareness. Certainly, some strongly habituated forms of eating, of which meat eating may take part, seem to either go unchallenged or even ignored. To establish the power of tacitly reproduced routines, in more detail, I now turn to the story of Sigrid to exemplify how some of my motivated informants seemingly engage in mindless meat-related doings.

For Sigrid, the project of meat reduction was shared by her husband and applicable to the food she prepared for family members; ‘I think that we, as a whole, form a [environmental] footprint’. Not only did she wish to reduce meat for environmental reasons, but also expressed concerns for her own and her children’s consumption of processed meat for health reasons; ‘Processed meat is a bad thing […] it concerns me, I do not want my kids to eat minced meat
every day’. Rather contradictory, however, her diary entries revealed the consumption of only processed meats; salamis, liver pâté-spread, chorizo, bacon and minced meat. Her doings included the servings of such meats to her children. Probing why Sigrid’s meat performances contradicted her motivations and intentions exposed interesting answers. For instance, the meaty and repetitive performance of preparing her children a packed lunch using bread and a liver pâté-based spread, appeared to be enacted mechanically, on ‘autopilot’:

    Sigrid: On second thought, If I’m preparing a slice of bread with liver pâté, I do not think about it at all. I have not contemplated it too much and then there are some conflicting interests there. I just want them [kids] to eat their food, first and foremost. […] [I]t is not embodied in the same way at all... It just happens automatically, and so I don’t reflect on it [meat use] when I prepare food for them [the kids]. When cooking dinner I think about it more, but not with that kind of meals, [like] breakfast.

Noticeably, Sigrid did not give much thought to the habituated practice of serving liver pâté, to her children. She justifies the regular serving of processed meat as a way to care for them. She wants her children, first of all, to eat food, which here, tacitly, involves a meat-based spread. Hence, there are some obvious conflicting teleoaffectivites at work, seeing that doing proper parenting cancel out her meat reduction engagement. More importantly in this context, we may highlight the role of tacit repetition; how certain doings indeed seem to go unnoticed and thus ‘unchecked’. For Sigrid, performing the making of packed lunch is not something that demands much meditation, which spur the reproduction of liver-pâté sandwiches as the way to go about the practice. Furthermore, by virtue of the collectively shared practice of which the routine draws on it seems to be repeated without challenge. This manner of making packed lunch for children is widely shared and accepted, performed by many Norwegian parents alike. Indeed, all the parents of younger children in my sample engaged in the same practice. In the Norwegian context, it is perhaps one of the most common foods to serve children, a staple of Norwegian parenting. A collectively shared routine implicitly agreed upon as a suitable way to perform. And so, it serves as an example of habituated normativity. As Warde (2016, 127) points out, routines are followed ‘because they express and meet the purpose that caused their adoption’. In the absence of any disturbances to the performances; say, kids returning home without having eaten the food or social criticism from other parents, there is no need for reflexivity to enter the process. Hence, we might interpret Sigrid’s routine of packing a liver-based meal to her children as a routine specifically resistant to change, because it, both socially and practically, continues to ‘meet the purpose that caused their adoption’ (Warde 2016, 127); namely a convenient,
nutritious and socially accepted way of feeding her children. However, Sigrid did not only serve meaty ‘spreads’ to her children. Cold cuts made up a substantial portion of Sigrid’s total consumption of meat. Further reflections revealed how particular meat use might stay hidden from the meat reducing agenda:

Sigrid: At the thought of eating less meat, one tends to think about dinner. At least that’s what I do and what is referred to when I talk to others about it. It's about not eating a burger, it's about dinner, but it is the deli meats that are difficult. It is the deli meats that tastes good. It has been a ‘black spot’ for me for a very long time. It actually took a very long time before I even thought about it - that reducing meat consumption is about not eating deli meats. When I first saw it in this way, it was kind of like ‘damn it’, it seems to be a lot of focus on the dinner… ‘meat-free Monday’ for instance, it's not about eating salami on a slice of bread on Monday, it's not about that … there is a difference there, in quantity, in a way, how much deli meats you actually eat. When we talk about it at home, we talk about what kind of dinner options we should have. […] We are not talking about vegetarian spreads at home, at all.

This excerpt illustrates an obvious point; that deli-meats or meaty-spreads may not be considered as the ‘important’ or significant portion of meat that needs moderation, from the perspective of a meat-reducer. More interestingly, however, Sigrid admits to how cold cuts have gone under the radar, a sort of ‘black spot’, illustrating how certain meaty performances may well go overlooked. This leaves some meat use almost ‘invisible’.

This sub-chapter has illustrated the agency of previously acquired ways of thinking and doing. Indeed, socialized into meat-intense ways of eating, the informants carry meaty habits, meat-dependant competences and ideas of meat-eating as essential, valued, and tasty - which complicates meat reduced-eating and limits the possible ways in which meat reduction might be enacted, in the present.
5.2. Navigating meat inducive environments
The influence of a socio-material environment, including technologies, infrastructures, material objects and the visible performance of other people, in guiding performances, are ascribed considerable importance in theories of practices (Shove et al. 2012, 23, Warde 2016, 134). In this subchapter I take a closer look at how physical environments, in a wide interpretation of the word, complicate my informants attempt to reduce meat consumption.

5.2.1. Material environment and accessibility
My findings suggest that physical environments may complicate the possibilities of doing meat-reduction in different ways. Sometimes, in making non-meat eating the less appropriate, less attractive, and less convenient choice. Other times, the lack of non-meat alternatives renders non-meat eating close to impossible. In the following sub-chapters, the first condition is exemplified by the practice of eating out, illustrating how food ‘choices’ are guided by clues and cues in the public cultural environment, scripting conventional meaty ways of eating. The latter condition is illustrated using the example of eating on the go, which demonstrates a material environment that is more directly constraining, in absolute terms. The selected examples are used not only to illustrate different forms of physical barriers, but to illustrate different degrees of material constraints.

5.2.1.1. A meat inducive public cultural environment
Building on DiMaggio’s (1997) account of how an external socio-material environment steers behaviour, Warde (2016) clarify the ways in which people might become positioned towards conventional forms of eating. Public culture embodies and express conventional ways of eating, which in turn is transmitted to people through the material environment that surrounds them on a daily basis; ‘in their homes, in the street, in the shops – through artefacts, symbols and signs’ but also through ‘singular and collective behaviour of observable others’ (135). People are regularly exposed to ideas of how to eat without consciously being aware or deliberatively engaging with such information. It follows that in the context of a Norwegian public cultural environment, that predominantly ascribes meat eating as normal, my meat reducing informants often find themselves engaging in an uphill battle. Not merely in the sense of being subconsciously fed meat-normalized ideas of eating, but primarily in the sense of often having to do the opposite of what is embodied in the environment as the practical and sensible thing to do. Examples of employers that provided meat-intensive lunches, eateries with meat-intensive menus, supermarkets providing cheap meats, friends and family with meat-intensive
understandings of proper eating provide illustrative. As Mikkel fittingly summarized; ‘eating meat is so easy, that's how it works in today's society. I mean, there is meat on sale all the time. Two packages off minced meat for twenty kroners, it’s easy to just go for that’.

Restaurant experiences provide particularly elucidating of what we may label a meat-inducive environment. Drawing on Warde’s (2016) ideas, we may conceptualize restaurants as a particularly concerted public display of the proper way to eat. The accounts of my informants revealed how such particular environments pushed them towards meat eating:

Question: Have you experienced any challenges trying to avoid meat at restaurant?

Mikkel: For instance, when I talked to dad yesterday, he had been to American Grill & Bar in Lillestrøm, and he said that we have to go there together and try it. I say ‘sure, but do they have anything vegetarian there? [and my dad reply] they probably have some salad or something similar. It is a meat restaurant though, so you just don’t ask for a vegetarian dish there […]. Dad loves those kinds of restaurants, such as Den Glade Gris (a meat-based restaurant which name roughly translates to ‘the happy pig’). These are restaurants that advertise meaty dishes. Meat is, sort of, their thing. So, I can imagine that it will be a bit challenging if the two of us go out to eat.

As illustrated in the above excerpt, some establishments may carry scripts of proper eating. In this particular case, a meat-eating-script seems to render vegetarian eating inappropriate, despite the accessibility of vegetarian options. As Warde (2016, 159) argues, the type of restaurant ‘creates expectations about what it would be appropriate to eat, anticipations which are symbolized by décor, the arrangement of furniture, table decorations, china and glassware, staff dresses, menus and opening hours’. Visualize how the meat-restaurant that Mikkel was referring to might provide the environmental cues for meat eating in particular ways; a table set with steak cutlery, a menu full of meaty-dishes, barbeque décor and rotisserie meats on display. Even their names carry meaty connotations. Hence, despite the availability of vegetarian options, meat eating may seem like the appropriate performance for Mikkel. Now, this situation was only hypothetical. Nonetheless, it does suggest the importance Mikkel attaches to following appropriate ways to eat across different venues. Hence, given how the environment and restaurant menus frame and constrain performances (Warde 2016), people may be steered towards meat eating despite their intentions of reducing meat.

Similar to Mikkel’s story, Sigrid recalled a recent visit to a restaurant where eating meat was ingrained in the experience; it was included in the multiple-course meal-menu of the day and so portrayed as the appropriate thing to eat. Here, the ‘choice’ of meat followed without much deliberation; ‘then I just, kind of, chose meat. I cannot even remember what kind of meat, but the way they presented it […] it made me want to taste it’. Sigrid’s account highlight how
meat eating may be scripted into the menu as the appropriate and sensually rewarding thing to do. Her ‘choice’ illustrates how meanings attached to eating out and the physical environment may work in tandem to qualify meat as the sensible thing to choose. When talking about eating out, my informants attached significance to meanings of pleasure and comfort, the physical sensation of taste and quality of meals. Inscribed in the teleo-affectivity of eating out was the implicit objective of seeking pleasurable experiences. This could be connected to the fact that eating out, in a Norwegian context, is mainly preformed as an infrequent leisure activity accompanied by friends and/or family (Lund, Kjærenes, and Holm 2017) and hence, seem to carry connotations of festivity and hedonism:

Egil When I’m eating out at a restaurant. I just go with whatever I want to eat. If they have quality fish, I’ll eat that. three out of five times I eat fish at restaurants, but then it has to be of great quality. If they have turbot, then I’ll just go for that, or if they have some interesting cod or anglerfish. I eat the best thing the restaurant has to offer, and if it’s a good restaurant, the fish-based dishes are very tasty. Me and my brother were at Theatercafeen (elegant restaurant, downtown Oslo) three weeks ago and we ate the finest steak. Occasionally, when I'm in Spain, I go cycling up to this peak to visit this particular restaurant with an open grill. Here you can eat steaks that are scorched on that grill with just salt and lemon. it's just absolutely sensational. When I can have quality meats like this, I allow myself to eat meat.

As illustrated by Egil, in recollecting moments of eating out many of my informants seemed to follow what was deemed an appropriate way to eat at a given restaurant. The dishes ordered frequently aligned with the proficiency and expertise of the restaurant, e.g., ordering steak at steakhouses, fish at sea-food restaurants and curry at Indian eateries. By some, proficiency seems to be tacitly associated with tasty dining. Consequently, by following the appropriate ways to eat at a restaurant, people safe-guarded a tasty and satisfying performance. Hence, these patterns of eating may signify tacit teleoaffective structures at work; prescribing what people are supposed to do (Schatzki 2002) when eating out, e.g., eating the dishes understood to be most tasteful. They may also suggest that people follow the scripting of particular ways to eat in the environment, as in the case with Mikkel above. It is likely that performances might draw a bit on both.

Few in numbers, vegetarian eating is often presented as mere ‘alternatives’ to the well composed range of tasty dishes on a menu. Additionally, as alternatives, they may possibly deviate from the proficiency of the restaurant in terms of cuisine or style of cooking. In this respect, vegetarian eating may clash with teleoaffectivities attached to that of eating out. For instance, going against the expertise of the restaurant, say by eating a salad at a burger joint, might be equated with a less tasty meal and less gratifying experience. It seems that for some
of my informants, being forced to choose one of the few vegetarian alternatives available, constrained the pleasure and joy gained from the performance. For Ylva, the general lack of a rich range of vegetarian eating, made avoiding meat when eating out more difficult:

**Question**

What makes it difficult to not eat meet when you’re dining out?

**Ylva**

I think it's just the lack of choices, that there’s a lack of meat-free options […]. It’s easier to avoid it [meat] when you cook the food yourself. I feel that most restaurants and take-out places have vegetarian options, but not necessarily that many. It’s not always easy to get the dish you want. An Indian restaurant may have a dish that is vegetarian, but you can’t get the non-vegetarian dishes as vegetarian. You can’t get tikka masala without chicken and with paneer instead (Indian cheese). You have to choose the paneer-dish they already have.

For her, tasteful eating took precedence over motivations to reduce meat when eating out. The activity also represented an opportunity to eat food she enjoyed but did not have the competence to prepare at home:

**Ylva**

[I]t depends on what they have on the menu… but I could go for a steak, because I don’t necessarily make it myself at home, but I like the taste […]. Or some fish. I actually really like fish, but I'm not good at preparing new fish-recipes either, and I rarely make white fish, unfortunately. I often cook the same salmon fillet dish and therefore I find it interesting to taste high quality fish when I’m dining out.

Hence, the availability of non-meat options far from guarantee non-meat eating. Rather, people would choose meat over fish or vegetarian eating if that made sense according to the teleoaffectivities connected to eating out.

### 5.2.1.2. Constrained performances of eating

The material environment did not only make meat eating more or less appropriate, but at times it would also heavily limit the ‘do-ability’ (Halkier 2010) of non-meat eating. This was made particularly evident in instances of eating on the go. Here the availability of non-meat eating is perceived as constraining in absolute terms. The material foodscape that frame performances of eating on the go in Norway consist of rather standardized menus; selection of hamburger and hotdog menus, relying heavily on meat from cattle, providing few alternatives, can be found across fast-food restaurants, gas stations, mall cafes, kiosks or roadside inns (Bugge, Lillebø, and Lavik 2009, 92). In other words, Norwegian foodsapes that provide opportunities for eating on the go are described as a segment that heavily supports meat eating. Although the selection of vegetarian alternatives at kiosks, gas-station or fast-food restaurants may have increased since this observation was made – particularly in urban spaces – there is reasons to believe that meaty dishes still dominate such foodsapes, particularly in the fast-food sector.
The experiences of my informants confirm this. There is a general impression amongst them that the availability of vegetarian options at restaurants, cafes, and places providing opportunities for eating on the go, have improved over the recent years. Simultaneously, they talk about instances where they feel trapped to perform meat eating, due to lack of available alternatives for non-meat eating.

Mikkel: I came all the way from Bergen. It was a late flight and we had to get up early the next day. My mother had been at work and dad was already at the cabin … we did not set aside time to prepare lunch or any other food for that matter, so the most natural thing is to stop by Espa (a popular gas station serving food). They only have baguettes with cheese and ham or pesto salami or … hot dogs.

Ylva: If I buy meat, it is usually as take-away (referring to ‘eating on the go’), not dinner but for lunch or a snack. For me that’s the most difficult situation to get hold of something meat-free. When I stop by 7-Eleven for a baguette, or I’m at an airport, I feel that all options include meat. You can either choose the one with roast beef, the one with chicken or the one with ham.

Mikkel and Ylva’s account illustrate how the physical environment may script meat eating not only as normal, but as the only way to perform eating. Not surprisingly, in the case of lacking suitable options for non-meat eating, my informants would normally resort to meat eating.

5.3. Negotiating meat reduction across social settings

Eating is widely recognized as socially structured (Delormier, Frohlich, and Potvin 2009) – heavily directed by social norms (Higgs 2015). As mentioned in the theoretical chapter, cultural readings have depicted consumption as a symbolic endeavour, wherein people consume goods to fit in or to distinguish themselves from a particular social group. Practice theory can be said to diverge from the notion of individuals actively choosing to communicate identity through purchasing decisions. Yet, the theoretical framework may still uphold the idea of consumption as a signifying practice, by focusing on the largely tacit preoccupations of fitting behaviour in line with the ‘normative accountability’ (Rouse 2007) of practice. Practice theory acknowledges that reflexivity might be involved in such processes, however, and importantly, ‘from a practice perspective the accepted norms and rules of behaviour in a given society are often tacitly accepted’ (Hansen 2016, 21). Indeed, fundamental to theories of practice is the agency credited to ‘tacitly accepted social rules and values’ (Sahakian & Wilhite 2014, 30).

In this subchapter I will look more closely at how my informants negotiated meat reduction across different social settings to highlight the many social conventions and norms that complicated meat reduction. I first look at negotiations in relations to domestic eating, and
second in relation to hosting or being guests. Central in this discussion is the normative performance of roles and responsibilities.

5.3.1. Domestic eating and meat reduction

Warde (1997) points out how the collective nature of domestic eating ascribe a particularly limited room for individual agency:

because people live in households, where food procurement and preparation are not equally shared, where decisions about what is to be eaten are usually collective, often vicarious, and only sometimes individual, it may be less open to individualizing tendencies than some other consumption fields (180).

Common amongst my non-single informants was to talk about the project of meat reduction as involving the total household. However, in practice, so to speak, the doings and perceived needs of other family members would often complicate meat avoidance. For instance, what became evident is that understandings of performing ‘parenting’ and being a good partner often would run in contradiction to the goal of reducing meat consumption.

5.3.1.1. ‘My kids need to eat’: meaty practices of care

All of the parents with younger kids living at home (four in total, see table 3) accounted their kids’ food practices as part of their meat-reduction project, a common project for the household. However, the interviews revealed that the understanding of ‘parenting’ and of doing meat reduction sometimes conflicted:

**Question:** do you reflect on the environmental footprint of your childrens’ meat eating?

**Sigrid**
Yes. Definitely. I think that we as a whole make up a footprint. But when all things are considered, I'm more concerned with them just eating their food. When I reflect on the way it really is, I do not think that ‘they should not have salami on a slice of bread’. That's how I think about my own eating; if I'm going to eat bacon or salami, I can split the meat and eat less of it. That's how I justify it. I make a system for myself that allows me to eat a bit of meat. I think that less is better than zero (i.e., eating less meat is better than not reducing at all), but I don’t think that way when I think about [the kids].

**Anna:**
For me, everything we buy - whether it is for ourselves or the children - counts as part of our total footprint, that there is no exception. At the same time […] it is important for me that my children eat, and that they not only eat bread. I mean, if I did not have children, then I would not have bought liver pâté all the time.
Sigrid’s and Anna’s account touch on some important themes across my findings. All of the parents in my sample justified serving meat for the sake of caring for their kids, despite being motivated to reduce meat across the total of household related practices. The significance of this is perhaps better understood when considering the failed attempts at substituting meat with non-meaty products. For instance, Anna had made attempts at replacing liver-pâté with a vegetable-pâté, but with limited success. After repeated experiences of having her kids return home from kindergarten with untouched sandwiches, she went back to the tried and trusted ‘liver-pâté’:

Anna: I tried with a kind of 'vegetarian thing' last week, because we got a free sample from Kolonial (a grocery delivery service). It was not approved [by the kids]. We tried many days; it just didn’t work. And I have no problem understanding it, it was a bit weird. Or … it was kind of nice - I thought it was perfectly fine - but it wasn’t liver pâté. It just wasn’t right. I thought; ‘well, we gave it a try’. I don’t know if I would have done it [long term] anyway. Doesn’t liver pâté contain vitamin A, which certainly is important. I don’t know. So yes, they eat liver-pâté.

Serving meat to one’s kids was not only assumed to be a safe and practical way to ensure that kids would eat, but also a way to safe-guard nutritional needs, as reflected in Anna’s sayings above and noted previously. More generally, parenting involved routinely making meaty compromises, beyond that of the regular liver-pâté serving. In many ways, fulfilling the needs of children heavily organized eating practices in the home, including what foodstuffs were bought and consumed. It is well described in the literature that attuning to children’s need influence domestic eating practices (see e.g., O’Neill et al. 2019, Warde 2016, 133). In relation to meat consumption, this was especially evident in the performance of dinner, where servings of meat were based on similar justifications and consequently entailed meat-eating for the entire family. Hence, some informants anticipated that doing parenting was one of, if not the, biggest challenge in reducing meat consumption:

Aurora: Our biggest challenge is that we have young children who control a lot of what is eaten at home. So, there will be a period now of 4-5 years where I cannot choose freely. Our hope and goal is that our children develop a taste for more flavours which would make it much easier to prepare tasty meat-free food. I would not say that is the only challenge, but it is the main one.

Thus, the understandings and teleoaffectivites of ‘doing parenting’ seem, in some cases, to endorse meat consumption. Through a practice theoretical lens, one might argue that the teleoaffective structures of doing parenting renders meat servings suitable or even necessary. It

---

9 as of April 2021 Kolonial changed name to ‘Oda’
becomes evident, then, that doing parenting appropriately takes precedence over that of doing meat reduction. In addition to going against quite basic human instincts, the possible consequences of serving kids an incomplete diet is obvious and may be target for extensive social criticism and even juridical punishment. In other words, it would heavily contradict satisfactory parenting. Hypothetically, it is plausible that the chance of receiving social reproach for not serving kids meaty foods are even higher than the contrary. Additionally, serving kids meat is a widely embraced and normalized way of doing. For instance, the serving of a liver-pâté sandwich to perform the making of a packed lunch (‘matpakke’) is so ingrained in Norwegian society at large and amongst individual bodies, that it may represent a highly tacit, collectively performed routine, not easily accessible for public scrutiny or that of individual revision.

5.3.1.2. I would not tell my spouse what not to eat: negotiating with partner
For most of my non-single informants (6 out of 7) meat reduction was said to be a shared project amongst themselves and their partners, yet, often described as not equally pursued. Most female informants (4 out of 5) explained how their male partner was less adherent to such undertaking, or more ‘lenient’ in their meat reduction engagements. This was partly based on the observation that their partner cooked up more meat compared to themselves. These observations were similarly retold by Sigrid, Ylva, Aurora and Anna. In addition, Emma recalled a similar experience from a previous relationship. This may suggest gender differences associated with the motivation to reduce meat consumption, a circumstance described in the literature (Kubberød et al. 2002, Rozin et al. 2012) and often explained as connected to ideas of masculinity (Kildal and Syse 2017, Lentz et al. 2018). A practice perspective might stress the point that males are less motivated to reduce meat because meat eating is tacitly accepted as part of what it means to do maleness. My data are not suited to draw any conclusions here, however, and more importantly, the conceived difference between my informants and their partner in actually doing meat reduction does have implications for my informants perceived, and possibly practical, success of doing so. Interestingly, most of them seem to accept their partners meat-intensive food dealings, without exerting much resistance in terms of negotiations. Rather, they were more inclined to shrug it off and go along with it. In other words, eating the meat they were served by their partner. This ‘reaction’, or more fittingly: inaction, seems to be connected to understandings of conviviality and courtesy. For Sigrid, not being ‘in charge’ of the everyday food practices in the home meant that she would often feel ‘forced’ to eat meats
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if that was what her husband cooked up and served. Due to a period of heavy work commitment, her husband was currently responsible for most of the household-related food practices. During our interview Sigrid recalled episodes of her husband cooking up meat for dinner, with disappointment; ‘meatloaf … really?’. Yet, afraid of coming across as ungrateful to what she believed to be compassionate and caring behaviour, she lets it pass:

Sigrid: We do talk about [meat reduction], he is also determined to decrease his consumption of meat, but practice it to a lesser extent than what I do […] He sometimes cooks up […] lasagna and pasta [with meat], and in those cases, I don’t feel that I can comment on it. I may mention it when we talk more generally about [meat consumption] but not when he cooks dinner for me when I arrive home [from work]. That would make me look very ungrateful.

Indeed, for Sigrid, negotiating meat reduction with her partner on a more general level seemed appropriate, but commenting on particular behaviour seemed to go counter to what was considered socially acceptable. Not surprisingly, this included commenting on instances of solo eating; ‘It would have been way too intrusive to tell him that I think he should not have a slice of salami on bread’. Rather, for reasons of courtesy, conviviality and gratefulness, Sigrid would seem obliged to display appreciation rather than resentment when served meat. This story touches on some important themes that were shared across several informants. Despite perceiving meat reduction as a ‘common project’, informants’ justify some of their meat doings on the grounds that they would rather not go to the lengths of telling their partner what to eat or not; and hence, join them in their more meat-intense ways.

It was only the case for one of the non-single informants, Sverre, that the project of meat-reduction was not shared by partner. Not surprisingly, doing meat reduction for him involved more friction and conflict inside the household. Although the attempt to reduce his intake of meat was incremental, the implementation of plant-based eating was not easily welcomed by his partner, who, as Sverre reflects below, was rather surprised by what she experienced as a sudden challenge to established eating practices in the home:

Sverre: [W]e had some relatively heated discussions at first and it went a bit like this: I got angry because I did not realize that this was a big deal. For me it was just a small change. While for her […] it means a lot that we can eat the same food when we eat together. Or if she’s cooking something, it means a lot to her that I can take part in enjoying that food. So, when I suddenly said: ‘No need to make steak for me, I can just take some of that mushroom stew […]’, she felt pretty upset about it.

What was made particularly apparent in Sverre’s case, due the conflicting viewpoints between him and his wife, was the social ‘do-ability’ (Halkier 2010) of trying to accommodate for two
different diets within the same meal. Trying to eat differently while eating together seemed to go at the expense of some highly valued social norms:

Sverre  
    Her experience of making two different dishes was that we did not eat together. That she would eat her meal and I would eat my meal. [...] If you are eating out at a restaurant, then you could perhaps do so, but at home, it is so important to share the meal. It's easy to think that it's just about changing the diet, but food is so much culture. Not only culture in the sense of ‘national dished’, but culture as in what we do when we're at home.

In breaking with the ‘normative accountability’ (Rouse 2007) of domestic eating, Sverre’s experience highlights the social significance of sharing the same meal and attached feelings of intimacy and unity.

What Sverre’s story so aptly illustrates is the social significance given to that of sharing meals. This view was widely held across my sample. Attached to understandings of a proper family dinner was meanings of intimacy, unity and togetherness. This connects well with Bugge’s (2019) description of Norwegian dinner as something carrying great social significance as a social ‘meeting point’, where families come together after a busy day to re-connect and be together (434–435). Intricately interwoven in these understandings was also the importance of sharing the same foodstuff. Contrarily, eating differently, was understood to go at the expense of the understanding of togetherness. Despite physically eating together, eating separate dishes was equated as not eating together. As Sigrid so aptly put it: when you're at home, everyone eats out of the same pot, it's an integral part of the homemade meal [...] you break bread'. The idea of cooking up and serving meat and non-meat alternatives side by side, was often rejected on the basis of these highly valued social norms. Consequently, my informants frequently surrendered to the meaty-dispositions of their partners when eating at home.

5.3.1.3. I eat what my family eats: synchronizing eating performances with the broader household

Not only social, but also practical matters pushed people towards eating what the greater household eat. Aurora, who held onto meaty servings for the sake of her children, rejected the idea of serving up alternatives such as a non-meat dish for her husband and herself, largely for reasons of convenience:

Question: You say you do not make two separate dinners, is this purely for practical reasons?

Aurora  Yes. I would say 90 percent practical. Simply put, I do not have the time. Strictly speaking, I would prefer the children to eat our food, but I think we just have to advance the dinners
gradually. If we eat our food and they eat their food, then there will never be any progress. We have to eat the same, it is a principle too, but even if I didn’t have that belief, we wouldn’t have had time to do it anyways.

Question: Would it be strange to eat two different dishes?

Aurora Yes, I think that’s strange.

Indeed, serving two different dishes for dinner was found to be both socially inappropriate and inconvenient. Furthermore, for Sigrid, serving up two different dishes did not only contradict the understandings of a proper dining, but also represented a sort of resignation:

Sigrid: Preferably, I would like everyone to do the same as me. I want it to be a collective project. That everyone should try. But by choosing this approach I feel it might be game over… or not over, but it implies that I accept that others can eat something else and [we will] lose the opportunity to do it together.

Hence, talking about the hypothetical meat-reducing strategy of cooking up different dishes to eat for dinner revealed specific limitations for the actual doing of meat reduction inside the household. Above, we have seen how family dynamics and accountabilities may push people towards meaty eating and servings, despite this being inconsistent with certain meat reducing motivations. The seemingly obvious solution of cooking up non-meat alternatives, so to escape the meaty dispositions and perceived needs of family members, were rejected on social and practical grounds and hence not pursued. Consequently, my informants’ eating habits were largely synchronized with that of the greater family. In practice theoretical terms we can say that doing meat reduction by means of cooking several dishes, can be interpreted as going against the ‘normative accountability’ (Rouse 2007) of family dining, and thus tacitly or explicitly rejected.

To summarize, projects of meat reduction within household related food practice are shaped by processes of negotiations between practical matters of convenience, expected social implications of particular servings, social roles and attached understandings of care, conviviality, and understandings of ‘proper’ ways of doing family dining. These factors come together and conjointly complicate meat reduction. It seems that meat reduction inside the household need to be understood as dependent on the intersection of different practices, being that of ‘parenting’, ‘partnership’ and ‘eating’, with their own, sometimes contradictory teleoaffective structures. These practices seen together qualify only a limited set of possible ways of doing meat reduction inside the home. Cooking up meat to safeguard kids’ health, alongside the significance attached to that of sharing meals and coupled with matters of
convenience and time limitations, renders the cooking of non-meat alternatives unreasonable and unlikely. In other words, a multifaceted set of components qualify ‘possible fields of action’ (Schatzki 1996, 167), rendering meat eating as the ‘rational’ thing to do. This helps explain why my informants ‘accept’ the meaty servings of their partners or join their children in meat eating, without displaying too much ambivalence or conflict. It explains why Aurora, as illustrated above, feels that what she eats at home is not really her ‘choice’.

These findings may clarify why Sigrid, which I have deliberately used as an example across this chapter, almost only consumes meat inside the household. Family dynamics seem to heavily affect her project of doing meat reduction, which says something about the significance and extent of family dynamics on eating behaviour. Another revealing proclamation amongst my informants, which strengthens the notion of strong family influences on projects of meat reduction, is the reasoning that ‘if it was only me, I would have consumed very little or no meat’. Different versions of this comment were observed across my interviews with Aurora, Anna and Emma, who claimed that if they were single and without kids, they would probably eat almost no meat.

5.3.1.4. The significance of ‘fractures’
Internal household negotiations illustrate how meat reduction is limited and enabled in complex ways by whom one shares dwelling and the conflicting teleoaffectivities across relevant practices. O’Neill et al. (2019) highlight similar findings when claiming that ‘the rhythms of family life and an ethics of care in providing ‘proper’ food for one’s family influence what is eaten (229)’. The literature on behaviour change depicts ruptures in people’s lives, such as moving houses, taking on a new relationship or having kids, as representing fleeting periods where a ‘windows of opportunity’ opens for change to occur (Warde 2016, 134). From what is illustrated above, a practice lens illustrates how seemingly unrelated changes in other practices have knock-on effects on eating and meat consumption. Again, this demonstrates the importance of understanding the interdependencies of practice. In relation to eating, O’Neill et al. (2019) suggest that transitions in eating practices and dietary changes may occur at points of ‘fractures’, and that these ‘fractures’ consequently may provide important openings for transition towards more sustainable food practices. The findings presented here endorse the understanding of ‘fractures’ – specifically having kids or taking on a new partner – as potent originators of change. However, and on the contrary, it illustrates how fractures may well represent moments of change towards increasingly meat dependent diets.
5.3.2. Hosting or being guest: pleasing others

Although the greater part of eating practices took place inside the home, in the company of family members, serving non-household members or eating as a guest constitute an important part of my informants eating practices. As illustrated in the previous subchapter, in circumstances of self-provisioning and inside-household eating, meat avoidance was limited and enabled by the negotiation of meat use between partners and the caring of kids. In this chapter, I illustrate how similar patterns of conforming to other people’s doing arise in negotiating meat reduction in the context of hosting and of being a guest.

One of the more explicit findings this study exposed was the significance people placed on not challenging other people’s performances of eating. Such negotiations did arise inside the household, as exemplified with Sigrid’s accounts above, yet, it was made most evident when people took on the role as dinner hosts or guest. Rather than imposing their own doctrines onto others, informants would adapt to other people’s dispositions. In general, the preoccupation with mounting performances appropriate to the normative accountability of the specific practice often took precedence over meat reducing intentions.
5.3.2.1. Hosting and eating with guests.

Meals arranged inside the household to be shared with non-household members form a meaningful mode of eating amongst my informants. Both friends and non-resident kin were regularly invited home, typically to share dinner. In doing hosting, my informants displayed the competence to fit performances of cooking to the requirements of specific occasions. Peoples preoccupation with mounting cooking performances relevant to social circumstance is well documented in the literature (See e.g., Julier 2013, Warde et al. 2020), and suggest the presence of unique teleoaffectivities across meal occasions. Indeed, the logics behind the different occasions seemed to significantly influence the set-up and content of the meal. For instance, by tailoring the meal after the degree of formality. Serving simple foods was appropriate if close non-resident kin visited on a weekday, while hosting a dinner during weekends would typically involve a fancier dish, or multiple courses. The hosting of more ceremonial events such as accommodating a Christmas dinner or a kids-birthday party, seemed to carry the most constricted scripts of cooking, and were characterized by highly limiting modes of appropriate engagements. For instance, serving up hot-dogs seem to be an integral part of hosting a birthday-party, while hosting a Christmas dinner demanded the traditional serving of specific meaty or fish-based dishes, depending on what sort of tradition one had been socialized into from early age. In other words, which dispositioned one carried was important here. These traditional food engagements also seemed the most fixed and thus resistant to change.

When talking about hosting dinner-guests, and predominantly those planned well ahead of time, specific food engagements as well as understandings and meanings surfaced. These conceptions differed from that of doing everyday cooking for household members. My informants typically invested more time and effort into preparing meals for guests and placed greater emphasis on the physical sensation of taste and quality of foods. For instance, one informant said she would not serve a simple meatloaf to her guest, while another said that she would probably serve either quality fish or game meat (game meat was often considered high-quality meat by my informants).

In general, understandings of doing proper hosting seem to be tangled up with values attached to care, hospitality and conviviality. Serving appropriate foods appeared to be ranked as most important in order to secure proper hospitality. Appropriateness was not only reliant on occasion, as illustrated above, but perhaps more importantly on the preferences of guest(s). Not surprisingly, then, the tacit aim of finding something appropriate for the particular guest(s)
seemed to heavily dictate what foodstuff was served. Thus, what was understood to be suitable in terms of what to serve was a matter of attaining to the dispositions of visitors. This is reflected in how Emma would always ask dinner guests beforehand about their preferences, and cook accordingly, or how Egil would depart from his normally meat- or fish-intensive dinners in order to please his visiting daughter preferences for vegetarian eating, or how Anna, surrounded by vegetarian and vegan friends, would never serve meat regardless, as a way to safeguard her guest’s preferences; a way to ‘play it safe’.

The notion that people are particularly concerned with performing the role of hostess in ways acceptable to their guests is echoed in previous research from the US and UK (Julier 2013, Warde et al. 2020). Here, performing correctly is described as a compassionate endeavour; where guests ‘needs, proclivities and dispositions’ has to be taken into account and translated into practice by adapting to shared understandings of appropriate dishes, servings and atmosphere. In essence; ‘there is a concern to modulate behaviour to make guests feel comfortable’ (Warde et al. 2020, 164). My interviews relived instances where doing hosting revealed a multitude of pressures and highly constrained forms of agency, guided by said preoccupations. Reflecting on hosting a birthday party for one of her kids, Anna’s contemplations expose multifaceted social manoeuvring. Here ‘doing hosting’ meant attaining to a wide variety of tastes, social pressures, practical burdens and responsibilities, leaving little room for agency:

Question: why did you choose to serve meat?

Anna I made other stuff as well… there was one guest that didn’t drink milk – she eat meat though but couldn’t tolerate milk – and then there was a mother who did not eat meat. And then, there are always adults and children at birthday parties, so I made vegan pizza rolls, cut up lots of vegetables. We also had hot dogs, because that’s what the kids want and that’s what’s always served at birthday parties […] practically speaking, I feel like I have very little choice […] and it is just very easy to serve hot dogs at a birthday party, very, very, very convenient, when there’s lots, lots, lots of children attending. Something everyone likes, something everyone is familiar with and everyone knows what to do with. Not much mess either.

Anna was not alone in modifying servings according to the dispositions of guests. It became clear that several of my informants did so when reminiscing of past performances or thinking in terms of hypothetical performances across different social spaces. What is interesting in this particular context, is how negotiations demonstrated that the significance of doing meat-reduction often faded relative to the significance of fitting performances to the dispositions of guests. While eating mainly plant-based himself, Sverre had no problem cooking up meat if that would please his visitors. In fact, he had done so on several occasions. He did not see it as
his guests’ task to eat plant-based just because that was what he preferred for himself. Sometimes he would join in on the meat eating, and other times he would manage to avoid it, depending on the dish. Ylva talked about varying the use of meat according to the people she served; for instance, in thinking about what to serve her friends from high school versus her husband’s friends. When thinking out loud about serving vegetarian foods to her pro vegetarian friends, she mimics positive verbal judgments. On the other hand, serving her husband’s friends vegetarian foods was connected to anxiety of judgment, being afraid that they would think of her vegetarian serving as silly, or not tasty enough, i.e. not appropriate. Accordingly, she ordered pizzas for delivery, with meat, when her husband’s friends came to visit, because that seemed like the appropriate thing to do.

What these examples illustrate, is how the teleoffective structure of doing ‘hosting’, with attached meanings of hospitality and conviviality, guide what foodstuff makes sense to serve. Being able to reduce meat across performances of hosting is hence largely reliant on the dispositions of guests. Meat-eating visitors might mandate meaty servings, while vegetarian guest mandate the serving of non-meat meals.

In summary, the findings suggest that all my informants are, to a large degree, concerned with performing the role of host in ways acceptable to their guests. These findings are echoed by research from Warde et al. (2020, 158) on urban UK food practitioners, arguing that ‘the evidence from the interviews is that almost every host is concerned to mount a performance acceptable to the social circles which they inhabit’. And so, the possibility to avoid meat across instances of hosting thus seems more dependent on the preferences and dispositions of guests, rather than the motivations of my informants.

5.3.2.2. Being a guest: ‘I eat what I am served’

When talking about performing meat-reduction in the context of being served food, my informants revealed remarkably similar sayings and doings. With the exception of two informants, none would ask family or friends to cater for their wish to eat vegetarian when served food away from home. They would rather eat what was served. When my informants were asked what they would do if served meat as guests, most answers aligned well with Aurora’s response; ‘what else are you going to eat? […] it would be completely inappropriate to ask someone to cook up something different, or to bring something [homemade]’. Furthermore, the two informants that occasionally did ask of their hosts to prepare meat-free meals, revealed they felt a lot of discomfort in doing so. In other words, there seems to be a
general reluctance to ask of others to cook in certain ways, and particularly vegetarian. This would not mean that meat was consumed every time a respondent would eat away from home, as many circled in social spaces where vegetarian eating was normalized. Nonetheless, this would constitute a noteworthy chunk of the amount of meat that some of my informants would consume, particularly amongst those who ate very little meat during moments of solo eating. Furthermore, it is interesting to note how some of my informants would eat meat so that they could eat what was served, despite meat avoidance being fairly achievable with minimal effort, illustrating the lengths one would go to perform what was deemed the appropriate way of eating as a guest. When described a hypothetical scenario where the meal made it possible to avoid meat, e.g. meat and other foods were separated, Anna would still struggle to curb her meat eating:

**Question:** Let's say you find yourself in a situation where meat is served but it is very obvious that the meat can be separated from the rest of the meal, practically speaking…

**Anna:** I actually don’t know (Anna interrupts the question). Unless it is grounded up and mixed together, I guess you might just avoid it (la det ligge). I probably think I would have eaten it, if I’m being completely honest, unless there were several options to choose from and I could have just selected something else instead. But if it would have looked like I was trying to make a point out of not eating meat then I would’ve… I don’t know. It would have felt like I was demanding something of them next time I was visiting. [*laughter*], ‘for your information, I don’t eat meat’. I eat what they serve. I probably would have just eaten [the meat], but maybe just a little… […] I doubt that I would manage to avoid it completely, unless it was a very natural and appropriate way to do it.

It would appear that my informants do what is in their power to carry out appropriate performances as guests in order to avoid social friction: to go along with the acceptable performance of a given practice, and in this case, to not impose their preferences on the way other people carry out their eating practices. Even amongst those informants whose diets are closest to vegetarianism or veganism (Mikkel and Sverre), going as far as to direct the way other people go about their eating practices seemed problematic. Sverre exercises a rather pragmatic approach to the issue. Most of the time, as he explains, people are usually very easy going on the matter and meat reduction can take place without any conflict or further negotiations. However, Sverre also gives examples of moments when he eats meat because rejecting it would go against social and cultural norms, such as notions of being a good son in law or being an honorable guest:
Sverre but of course, if we visit Amanda’s (his wife) biological family in Chile… they would probably have a stroke if I said ‘no, I don’t eat meat’. […] It is about being pragmatic. They [would] slaughter a sheep and cook it for twelve hours as a way to display hospitality, to show that they are happy that [we] came. So, there is something about showing that you apricate them too.

For him, eating meat on these occasions was a way to make meat reduction doable without sacrificing social relations, and about respecting other people’s food preferences and food culture. Furthermore, when the meaty dish served aligned with his view of appropriate healthy eating (i.e. not processed foods) it seems that meat-eating could take place without much personal ambivalence:

Question: Could you have asked of your in-laws (referring to his wife’s adoptive parents) to accommodate for your wish to not eat meat?

Sverre They know I eat like that, but they also know that I'm easy going when it comes to these things. Sometimes they will ask me, do you eat like this and like that, and I just say: ‘make what you want’, because… they’ve had dinner at five every day since the dawn of time … here’s the thing, you get tasty and healthy food no matter what they serve you … I don’t even know if ‘frozen pizza’ and ‘takeout’ exist in their vocabulary (* laughter *) so it doesn’t really matter.

For Mikkel on the other hand, who eats almost no meat during solo-eating and expressed little issues in doing so, meat-reduction in social settings became more of a challenge. Eating most of his meals alone, or having self-provisioned food in other people’s company (e.g. lunch), Mikkel seemed to encounter few obstacles with eating meat-free and plant-based in everyday life. However, moving from the realm of solo-eating to social-eating presents quite different challenges. Reflecting on the matter, Mikkel’s negotiations illustrate social apprehensions and social manoeuvrings across different social contexts:

Mikkel Like with this specific group for friends; some are gluten allergic, some are lactose intolerant. So, when we meet up to cook there is already quite a lot [of preferences] to take into consideration. And then, a friend tells me how annoying it is when people have alle these dietary requests; ‘can we eat this instead of that, because I’m on this diet and this other girl is on this diet’. When there is a big social gathering like that, I could have just brought some premade food, but on a cabin trip it’s a bit tricky when I’m already carrying several liters of beer (ørten liter øl)… it’s just a lot, you know. So, in those cases I just don’t bother taking the fight. But, when we met for brunch yesterday, for instance, then it was easier, because it’s just a small group. I feel at least that it is much easier to take that battle then, to say ‘hi, I don’t eat meat, can we take that into consideration. Maybe we could make some vegetarian for everyone?’ Try to ‘pitch’ it as a good thing. But, yeah, larger get-togethers are much harder.
Similar dynamics and negotiations can also be found when guests provide the food. For Aurora, this occurs when her children’s grandparents bring food into their house as a way of helping out in their busy everyday lives:

Aurora

From time to time, the guest might bring food… grandparents and such… they are welcome to bring whatever … I wouldn’t be picky about it. Grandma likes to bring meatballs, which we will eat together.

Hence, the success of meat-reduction in instances of eating as guest, for most of my informants, was fully dependent on what they happened to be served. It was not considered socially appropriate to ask a host to take their preferences into account when cooking up a meal, nor was it deemed acceptable to bring your own meat-free dish.

### 5.3.2.3. Adjusting conduct appropriately to different social settings

As this sub-chapter illustrates, my informants expressed going to great lengths not to break with social norms. Instead, the preferred approach was to align performances to the teleaffectivities of practice, i.e., conventional ways of eating. In the words of Warde (2016, 15), ‘the problem is one of adjusting conduct appropriately to different social settings and meal occasions’ (15). By illustrating how eating behaviour is guided by what is considered appropriate or expected across different settings, including conforming to the dispositions of peers, the findings illuminate the importance of established norms within social networks for the implementation of meat-reduced diets. This strengthens Warde’s assumption that ‘a favourable context, involving a collective programme and peer approval, makes individual change in behaviour much more likely’ (Warde 2016, 146).

### 5.4. From elements to social site; multidimensionally qualified do-abilities

In the above, I have illustrated the agentic influences of material, social and bodily elements in directing performances of eating. One aspect is recognizing the possible capacity of the respective elements to take on agency. Another aspect is to understand the details of how dispositioned bodies and extant structures, in tandem, qualify possible ways of doing. This is particularly important when so much behaviour – doings and sayings – is conceptualized as tacit and perhaps unspoken, as theories of practice would have it. Indeed, involved in the qualifying of actions are a ‘heterogeneous array of forces the exact influence of which cannot be precisely measured’ (Warde 2016, 147). What became obvious, however, is how different
elements typically worked together to qualify meat-reduction as more or less doable. Again, this emphasizes the importance of understanding the interdependencies of practices and its constituting rudiments. In the following, I provide an example of situated action, demonstrating how the coming together of several elements qualify rather limited ways to engage in meat reduction. Ultimately, this illustrates how the social site renders meat eating sensible, meaningful and appropriate, despite intentions to avoid meat consumption.

5.4.1. Example: eating out, a socially and materially constrained endeavour
While the idea of vegetarian eating is increasingly normalized amongst the public, vegetarian eating at restaurants remains in the periphery for what is deemed appropriate. Indeed, talking about restaurants as facilitating for ‘vegetarian alternatives’, is in itself telling. From a rational choice perspective, one could argue that people wanting to reduce meat eating could easily just choose to go to restaurants better suited for vegetarian or seafood eating. However, none of my informants mention this as a deliberate strategy to avoid meat eating. Choice of restaurant is rarely talked about as one of individual choice or heavy deliberation, but rather, a decision largely in the hands of fellow diners. This is particularly the case when taking the role as an invitee. As argued by Warde (2016, 161), since most people eat in the company of others, several features of the performance are outside the control of participants. Research done on the practice of eating out in the UK illustrates how people often have little to no say on when and where to eat out (Warde and Martens 2000).

Being one of two informants who only occasionally consumed meat, Mikkel’s meat reducing negotiations in the context of social and material constraints serve as a fitting example. Let us recall Mikkel’s story of being invited by his dad to a meat-based restaurant, where meat eating was considered the only appropriate thing to do:

Mikkel … it is a meat restaurant though, so you just don’t ask for a vegetarian dish there […]. Dad loves those kinds of restaurants, such as Den Glade Gris. These are restaurants that advertise meaty dishes. Meat is, sort of, their thing. So, I can imagine that it will be a bit challenging if the two of us go out to eat.

Mikkel continued to pounder hypotheticals:

Mikkel On social occasions, on birthdays and such, it depends on who decides the restaurant
Question: What if your friend who is celebrating his birthday wants to go to Den Glade Gris, would you have gone along with the meat eating?

Mikkel: Yes, I would have probably done so, because I really hate to be a nuisance (være til bry) Yes, I could have eaten at home, waited a bit and arrived later, after they were done eating, but then I would miss out on a lot of the social stuff.

As illustrated by Mikkel’s accounts, multifaceted elements qualify meat eating as sensible. Mikkel’s negotiations illustrate how different social and material elements in tandem renders meat-eating the sensible thing to do. First, the restaurant is one that scripts meat eating, and is a place where it would not be appropriate to perform vegetarian eating. Second, significance is given to conviviality in this particular setting, further pushing him to just go along with what everybody else is doing to avoid creating any social friction. Third, the alternative of eating before arriving, to avoid meat, seems to equal too much social sacrifice. This is why Warde (2016) suggests that eating out may come with even fewer freedoms compared to that of eating at home. Indeed, ‘the restaurant experience […] is rather less affected by informalization than eating at home, leaving the customer with less discretions (164). What Mikkel’s negotiations illustrate is how acts are nested into a complex socio-material context limiting possible do-abilities.

Similar to Mikkel, many of my informants displayed rather complex negotiations, illustrating how the social, material, and bodily elements came together and qualified meat eating as the appropriate thing to do. When justifying their meat consumption there were almost always multiple elements at play, which rendered meat eating as sensible on various occasions, when not entirely abstaining from it. Understanding the implementation of non-meat eating as happening in a meat-inducive social and material environment, through a body-mind carrying meaty competences (dispositions and procedures), it seems rather obvious that complications may arise. And so, to borrow from Schatzki (2002), it becomes evident that elements of the individual and structure together often ‘multidimensionally qualify’ (230) meat eating as the seasonable thing to do

5.5. Closing remarks
In this chapter I have identified factors that complicate and circumscribe efforts of meat reduction. Negotiations across different practices have helped exposed how the agency in bodies, material environment and social setting complicate meat reduction in a multitude of ways. When we account for the ‘social and personal histories inscribed in the body’ (Shakian & Wilhite 2014, 28), it becomes clear that past experiences carry agency into present doings,
limiting the range of likely trodden meat reduction paths. Some meaty doings might slip under the cognizant radar due to the largely tacitly and mechanical nature of eating. Further, accounting for the agency of the material world reveals how a meat inducive material environment, subtending the broad normalization of meat-intense eating, push people towards meat eating. At last, recognizing the social dimension of eating illustrates how food choices are pushed beyond individual control, structured by the needs and dispositions of family members and friends. Meat reduction is often portrayed as an inferior priority compared to the preoccupations of conforming eating in line with the norms of practice and the expectations of others. When all these elements come together and conjointly qualify ‘possible fields of action’ (Schatzki 1996, 167), ways of doing meat reduction seems greatly constrained.
6. PRACTICING MEAT CONSUMPTION AND MEAT REDUCTION: CONVENIENCE, NORMATIVITY AND BOUNDED CREATIVITY

In this final analytical section, I compile the findings from previous analytical chapters and bring in further results to clarify some key themes that emerge from this study. First, I present my informants’ search for convenience as a cross cutting theme, which illustrate how meat eating is qualified as appropriate and practical by the interdependent workings of various social, material and bodily elements. Second, I further explore the observation from previous chapters that performances often conform to what the social site scripts as appropriate behaviour. The discussion suggests that performances of eating often tacitly and intuitively conform to different normative spaces, following past processes of socialisation and habituation. This put further emphasis on the importance of context in enabling or complicating meat reduced eating. Third, in the last section, I elucidate how my informants’ intentions and efforts at reducing their consumption of meat is embedded in and bounded by practices, which ultimately draw up a delimited sense of personal agency in doing meat reduction.

6.1. Performing convenience

The way my informants eating practices are guided and structured by shared ideas of convenience, provide a cross cutting example of how meat eating is rendered appropriate by a manifold of practices and their constituting elements. The frequency of meaty performances executed in the name of convenience may only sufficiently be explained by capturing how acts are multidimensionally qualified, paying attention to understandings of ‘proper’ and ‘filling’ foods (body), the accessibility and availability of convenience food (physical environment), collectively shared rhythms and the need for time-shifting resources to manage everyday life (social), opposing teleoaffectivities (the carrying of multiple practices) and much more.

The reliance on convenience across performances of everyday eating was touched upon in all interviews, even without probing for such topics to be discussed, signifying its importance in structuring my informants’ food practices. These doings included, but where not limited to, the use of dishes consider easy and fast to prepare; cooking, serving and eating ‘convenience food’ such as frozen pizzas or hot dogs or ‘semi-conveniencen food’ (Jackson and Viehoff 2016, 4) such as pre-cut and frozen vegetables or fish-cakes; instances of eating convenient meals to alleviate hunger on the go and ordering ‘take-away’ meals for the sake of ease. Understandings of convenience fit well with the notion that people rely on habituated and socially endorsed
routines to get by *effectively* in everyday life. In this subchapter, I describe how the dependance on convenient performances of eating complicate the reduction of meat in the context of my informants’ daily lives. I also discuss the potential of meat-replacement products to enable convenient meat reduction in light of my informants' doings and sayings.

### 6.1.1. Meat dependent convenience

Convenience represented a struggle for my meat reducing informants. For most of them, meats where heavily incorporated into their arsenal of convenient dishes to serve and eat. Despite going against intentions of moderation, certain meaty doings were continued in the name of convenience, because they played a significant role in the management of everyday life. The recurrent consumption of meaty hotdogs may prove an elucidating example.

The hotdog - a staple of convenience food - seem to be widely incorporated into everyday life to execute hassle free, time-saving performances of eating. By my informants they are used and understood as appropriate performances of eating across social settings such as barbecuing and birthday-parties, consumed on hikes for its inherent qualities of ease and comfort and frequently devoured ‘on the go’ as a quick, handy and nutritionally dense meal. Here, convenience do not only refer to preparation, i.e., buying, cooking, serving, but also to the ease and appropriateness of implementation across different social contexts. This notion of convenience is made possible by the pre-approval of sausage eating as a suitable performance by virtue of a collectively shared practice. In the Norwegian context, such acts are customary across a wide range of eating performances and supported by a hot-dog inducive public cultural environment; promoted and served at every corner shop or gas-stations; heavily featured in tv commercials (Rosenberg and Vittersø 2014), a central element of Norwegian barbeque practices, sold at many sporting arenas, and deeply ingrained in occasions of great importance, such as kids’ birthday parties and the Norwegian constitution day. Additionally, embraced as an appropriate performance of family dinner. Rarely would eating sausages represent a case of social criticism or reproach.

My informants struggled to find suitable alternatives to the convenience offered up by hot dog eating, particularly on the go. For these reasons it seems as though hot-dog eating may become ingrained as a *habit of convenience*, particularly difficult to escape:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Do you often eat ‘on the go’?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>I try to avoid it. If I can plan ahead […] I avoid eating hot dogs on the go, for instance, but it happens from time to time, roughly every other week. Lately, it has been happening surprisingly often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: So, you eat primarily hot dogs on the go?

Emma: Or a bananas [...] But the hot dog has somehow become a thing, and if it is on sale, then I’m like ‘woohoo, party!’

Question: But why hot dogs?

Emma: It is very convenient to eat [...]. For me [hot dogs] are typical eating on the go food [...] so I guess it’s the practical part, its food that you can hold (det er holdemai), its more convenient to buy a hot dog [compared to] a slice of pizza from 7-eleven (a Norwegian corner shop chain), which I have never done. I mean, hot dog is hot dog, but a slice of pizza doesn’t look much appetizing, disgusting, fluid...not very rational, just emotionally driven.

Question: Have you ever contemplated what else you could buy?

Emma: Yeah, like, yoghurt for instance [...] but then again, I think meat leaves me full, like hot dogs for example, it lasts longer… that could be another reason for choosing it over yoghurt.

As illustrated by Emblas account of frequently eating hot dogs, meaty convenience food on the go were associated with ease in terms of offering a quick and filling meal, amongst my informants – particularly so in the absence of ‘proper’ non-meat replacement when eating on the go. As Yngve said energetically; ‘what am I supposed to eat then, apples!? That does not help me’. Furthermore, it illustrates the proficiency of meaty convenience to alleviating hunger in the face of spatiotemporal constrains. The eating of meaty convenience food was often enacted in-between other practices, traveling from one social activity to another or in-between work and leisure activities. In other words, meaty convenience represented spatiotemporally fitting way to appropriately, alleviate ones’ hunger. Representing a solution to a multitude of perceived needs available alternatives could not provide.

Interestingly, during our talk, Emma questions her understanding of hotdog as ‘filling’, yet still frequently perform the routine. This and similar episodes of people eating hot dogs on the go, despite intentions not to suggest habituation. In this sense, Emma’s case may indicate the performance of meaty convenience as a habit. When the appropriate environmental cues are present, the routine of eating hot dogs commence almost instinctively. For instance, as mentioned above Egil explicitly stated he had stopped eating sausages on the go in our interview but still did so, according to his diary entries. In the case of one week, he had done so twice. It seems as though he tacitly presumes that a hot dog is the only solution to his needs. This may be interpreted as habituation obstructing him from seeing differently.

For Sigrid, hot dogs provided a convenient solution to serve to her kids, in the carrying out of a social barbeque. Relying on this form of eating to ensure foreseeable social flow;
Sigrid: We had a discussion about what to serve the kids, maybe we can just serve them hot dogs, because it’s easy and simple and there’s very little clutter. They tend to make a mess with the burgers, hot dogs are [more] convenient to handle.

When faced with the hypothetical question of using something else to serve the children Sigrid replied:

Sigrid: If I were to buy and serve them a vegetarian hot dog, but they wouldn’t eat it… again, you just want your kids to eat, especially on such occasions, when we are not sitting around the kitchen table at home but eat amongst lots of people and you just want everything to run smoothly, we just don’t want any friction, you just want everything to flow, then you [trust] the tried and tested (gode gamle) hot dog.

Sigrid’s serving of hot dogs to her children at a social gathering was justified as a practical solution to friction-less, predictable social implementation. It exemplifies the properties of some meaty dishes to ensure ease of preparation and predictable outcomes. Her justifications points to the importance ascribed to meat by many of my informants, to provide mundane effectiveness in the management of everyday life. For instance, meaty servings were often justified on the grounds of being time-efficient to cook. Or for parents, justified because it would guarantee that children would actually eat the meal, which they had experienced far from ‘a given’ in the case of non-meat servings. Say, when lunch boxes came back untouched because Anna tried to substitute the acquainted liver-pâté (leverpostei) with a vegetable- spread. Hence, Sigrids story illustrates a form of planning with meat to ensure convenience and comfort.

Almost all my informants associate meaty dishes with ease, speed and convenience; dishes that provide fast, nutritious (for some) solutions to the temporal pressures of everyday life. This, in turn, was connected to ideas that non-meaty meals were more complicated and time consuming to prepare:

Mikkel: Eating meat is extremely convenient. It’s fast, it’s what I grew up with, so I kind of just know what to do.

Question: What do you mean by ‘fast’?

Mikkel: Fast to prepare. Hamburgers for instance, just buy an 8-pack with frozen burgers for 30 – 40 kroners and throw it in the pan, cook for five minutes, then you have dinner. However, the other day when I made vegan burgers using sweet potato and beans… it just takes so much more time, it took me an hour to make a complete dinner. If i used meat, it would have taken me ten minutes.

Intricately connected to ideas of convenience was competence, as illustrated by Mikkel’s sayings. Being competent in cooking up a dish was tied to a hassle free and time-effective
performance of a practice. This notion may be expanded to ideas of managing dish repertoire. As we saw in chapter four, managing dish repertoire was used as a strategy to avoid meaty eating. On the flip side, some informants justified keeping meaty dishes as part of ones’ repertoire for the sake of convenience. For instance, Aurora valued the meaty dishes in her repertoire of frequently served dinners for their quick and easy preparation. To allow for an easier management of everyday life and a hassle-free way of feeding the kids, ‘we simply have to supplement with meaty dishes (Aurora).

The connections made between convenience and meat amongst my informant’s echo what Mylan (2018) found in her research on meat reducers in the UK; that meat embodies meanings of ease and convenience. More importantly, Mylan points out that

the conditions in which these characteristics (that meat is easy and convenient) take shape extend beyond the particular dishes of which they form a part […] [t]he fact that meat is taken for granted as an easy and convenient way of providing appropriate food is reproduced alongside multiple activities of daily life […] This observation emphasises the importance of looking beyond the selection of dishes at moments of eating in order to identify the factors that hold meat eating and meat provision stable alongside multiple activities of daily life, even in the face of concerted attempts to reduce it (Mylan 2018, 11)

Indeed, by relying on meaty dishes to ensure mundane effectiveness - i.e. trusting meaty dishes to effectively manage socio-temporal and spatiotemporal constraints in everyday life – my informants performances illustrate the practical significance of meat that connects its use to issues beyond eating. As Halkier (2016) suggest, to comprehend the significance of convenience food – how it is used, appropriated and made sense of in everyday life – we need to understand its relations to a variety of practices affecting how people eat. As illustrated by the above, ‘doing parenting’ emerge as a good example. Indeed, the use of convenience food have been acknowledged as linked to parenting practices and attached teleoaffectivities such as that of ‘feeding the family’. In time-poor and stressed circumstances ‘involving competing social schedules and the orchestration of complex domestic routines’, convenience and care might very well go ‘hand in hand’ (Jackson and Viehoff 2016). Additionally, my data suggest that practices such as those of going to the gym, socializing and working could all be connected to matters of convenient food ‘choices’. For instance, in the way that busy schedules produced spatiotemporal constrains, such as in the excerpt above, when Emma had to squeeze a convenient hot dog in between working out and socializing.

If we are to believe that individuals have to navigate ‘increasingly complex timescapes […] characterized by fragmentation’ (Shove 2012, 9), and ‘commonly perceive […] that there is an increasing shortage of time’ (Southerton 2003, 6) the dependence on convenience foods,
with ‘time-saving’ and ‘time-shifting’ qualities (Jackson and Viehoff 2016) seem rather obvious. As noted by Jackson and Viehoff (2016) the widespread appropriation of convenience food implies that they ‘fit’ well with the ‘routines and rhythms of consumers other food-related practices and with the often-competing demands of their working, family and leisure commitments’ (9). Coupling this with a meat inducing foodscape which greatly facilitate convenient meat eating on the go and supply a meat-heavy range of convivence foods, e.g., hot dogs, burgers or meaty frozen pizzas, a notion of meat dependency emerge. In this way the provision and distribution of meaty convenience meals both responds to and co-create demand. In other words, reliance on convenient, time-saving ways to eat, of which, meaty options dominate, materializes as a formula for meat dependance. This directs emphasis away from personal motivations to reduce meat, towards the many practices, and accountabilities therein, which together qualify convenient meat eating as the sensible thing to do.


On the surface, the substitution of meats with meat alternatives, seems to represent a convenient avenue for meat reduction, fitting well with peoples suits of competent procedures. They may be cooked up using similar skills and methods in dishes like hot-dogs, burgers or even tacos. These products are also becoming widely accessible particularly in and around urban areas where most stores sell them. They also usually mimic typical convenience food and could hence fit into the need for convenient foodstuff in the management of everyday life. In other words, such products seem to fit people’s competence and need for convenience. Hence, meat-alternatives seem to represent a plausible avenue for meat reduction in line with Spurling and McMeekin (2015) idea of ‘re-crafting practices’; mitigating the resource intensity of practice through changing up one or more of its elements. On similar grounds, such substitutes have been proposed as an ‘aid to transition’ allowing a high degree of continuity moving between omnivorous, vegetarian and vegan diets:

Substitutes can be seen as aids to transition because they allow for a high degree of continuity moving between omnivorous, vegetarian and vegan diets. They afford less disruption to pre-established eating routines and consequently can potentially attract new practitioners. Like all processed foods vegan substitutes are examples of skilling the material whereby competences can be built into the materiality of practice affording a temporal saving (Twine 2017, 172).
The findings here provide some nuance to this statement. Some of my informants indeed used meat replacement products, such as when cooking up burgers or vegetarian chicken nuggets. On some occasions, for some of my informants, such products did indeed represent a convenient way to recraft a meaty dish. As Sverre told me ‘I like the Beyond Burger (a specific meat replacement product), it works well to replace the meat, it serves the same purpose, I just prepare it and add some side’. However, meat-substitutes were only used infrequently on almost never for other meals than when eating burgers. Now why is that? First of all, some of my informants did not regard meat substitutes as particularly tasty, and hence regarded them as inappropriate substitutes, going counter to ideas of food as pleasure. Second, for many of my informant’s meat-alternatives seems to conflict with understandings of proper and healthy eating. For instance, it seems to go counter to Egil’s high cultured ways of eating and the importance he attested to making food from scratch using quality produce. Even more explicitly it conflicted with the importance attested to healthy, clean, eating, held by Mikkel, Sverre, and Nina. This is an important finding, particularly important for understanding the potential uptake of meat-replacements in the Norwegian context, where general understandings shared across the Norwegian population attest high importance to clean healthy eating, made from scratch (Bugge 2015, 51 - 53). Regarded as highly processed foods, meat substitutes, seem to conflict these understanding of proper eating. Indeed, meat substitutes where particularly problematized amongst the informants who were motivated to eat less meat because of health reasons. This echoes parts of Twine’s (2017) findings when studying vegans in the UK;

Substitutes can be perceived as highly processed foods (there is much variation between them on this) and this can clash with often highly valued health meanings associated with vegan practice (173).

This may explain why, as we saw in chapter 4, other ways of meat replacement are performed more often. In my sample, meat was typically substituted with vegetables legumes or fish, rather than meat-replacement products. This may be connected to the importance attached to clean healthy eating amongst my informants. In other words, it makes sense for them to replace meat with vegetables, legumes or fish because they fit understandings of ‘proper’, healthy eating. Why burgers represented the only dish which most of my informants occasionally prepared using a meat-replacement substitute might be because burgers, in general, are not assumed to be a particularly healthy dish. Hence the processed burger fit well within the understanding connected to the dish. Another reason might be that vegetarian or vegan burgers have become widely normalized across fast food joints and restaurants serving burgers.
6.2. Performing habitaulized normativity

My informants concern of mounting performances appropriate with the ‘normative accountability’ (Rouse 2007) of practice across a diverse set of contexts was made evident in the above. In the language of Halkier (2010), we might paraphrase this as ‘performing normativity’;

‘normative regulation of consumption moments in food practices is a continuous practical and discursive accomplishment among food practitioners as they play out and negotiate normatively acceptable and expectable conduct’ (37).

When giving justifications for why they worry so greatly about doing what is expected of them, my informants mainly talk about the risk of social critique and reproach that comes with doing something differently— that is, not aligning action with ‘shared understandings of normality’ (Evans, McMeekin, and Southerton 2012, 116). It is simply not worth ‘taking that fight’, risking social relations for the sake of reducing meat in certain instances of eating, as Mikkel told me.

However, while able to voice rather complex negotiations in an interview setting, the general findings suggest that there is little reason to believe that people go about making decisions in everyday life based on extensive reflections of what is the wrong or right thing to do. Being able to relive memories and justify behavior do not imply that people engaged in heavy negotiation or deliberation before acting. As Warde (2017) notes, paraphrasing Haidt (2007); ‘mostly we act instinctively and then construct a reason afterwards for our behavior’ (195). Furthermore, my informants were regularly unable to provide elaborate explanations for their eating behavior. The frequency of justification like ‘that’s just what you do’ or ‘I did so because I was hungry’ verifies this notion, as do the observation made in chapter 5.1, that most of eating is performed ‘in a state of distraction’ (Warde 2016, 102). In practice theoretical language, rather than implementing calculated acts, people seem to possess an instinctive capacity to go on in everyday life implementing sensible acts in an ongoing flow of activity, often reproducing what has previously been done or doing what is perceived as the normal and acceptable thing to do. Anna serves hot dogs at a kids-birthday party because ‘that’s what everyone does’ and Mikkel, does not ask for a vegetarian option at a meat-based restaurant because ‘you just don’t do that’. Indeed, overall, much of the performances of my informants seem to be guided by a tacit sense of normativity, which, as we saw in the theoretical chapter, is made possible by habituation. Hence, a more convincing explanation than calculated acts on the basis of extensive negotiations, is that people’s action tacitly and instinctively synchronizes
with the normative accountability of the practice. This subchapter elucidates this argument and expose some of its implications for efforts at reducing meat consumption

Instances of conforming to the normative accountability of the practice and attached social roles, can be traced across multiple performances, described in chapter 5—albeit taking on different natures. For instance, while doing domestic eating, my informants conform to the normative accountability of ‘parenting’, ‘partnering’ and family dining. When cooking up food for guest’s they conform to the accountability of the role as host and hence tailor servings to please guests. When eating out their ‘choices’ follow the proficiency of the kitchen or what is scripted as the appropriate way to eat. Often, performing normativity take precedence over that of doing meat reduction.

6.2.1. Performing fluid normativity.
Observed across the stories of my informants is the act of tacitly tailoring performances of eating to different spaces of normativity. These sites varyingly scripted meat eating as something one should or should not do.

For many, meat reduction seems normal, almost ‘a given’, in particular social sets:

Question: Do you often talk about meat reduction amongst friends?
Aurora: No, not often, sometimes maybe, more in the past, maybe two three years back. Now it has become the new normal, in a way.

Question: Do you label yourself a flexitarian?
Emma: No, I haven’t done that for a long time, actually. We used to do so, ten years ago maybe, but we don’t talk about it in that way anymore. It’s like… that’s just how we eat.

These sayings display a heavy sense of normalisation to the point where non-meat-eating is implicitly understood as the standard way to go about eating in certain social spaces. Both Aurora and Emma talk about how eating in these contexts permits the tacit performance of non-meat-eating. Meaning that, non-meat eating is not necessarily the result of meat reducers acting on their intention, but rather implicitly follows as the normal thing to do. It is, as Aurora says, ‘the new normal’. This is made particularly evident when recalling my interview with Anna. Embedded in a social network where non-meat eating was considered the norm, she would always cook up a meat-free dinner when having friends over because that would safe-guard an acceptable performance. Interestingly though, the same informants participated in eating across social milieux where meat eating was equally normalized and tacitly performed – social sites
in which they typically adopted to meat eating. For instance, as illustrated in chapter 5, for both Anna and Aurora, the home typically represented a space in which meat eating was tacitly performed. Hence, they conveyed the capacity of tacitly conforming their performances across different spaces of normativity, hence, performing fluid normativity.

Emma’s case, provide a pertinent example of the habituation of setting, allow for the instinctive malleability of performances / allow for fluid normativity to be performed instinctively. For her, eating amongst colleagues compared to eating amongst friends, embodied two different sets of normativity. At work, eating meat on a sandwich or in a salad was a typical normalized way of going about lunch, performed by many of her coworkers, made available through a vast selection of meaty foodstuff routinely bought in and made available by her employer. In other words, meat eating was both physically and socially facilitated. When recollecting being introduced to these eating practices at work, she remembers being startled by the generous servings of meat:

Emma: [I] remember when I started working there last year, there were such huge amounts of cold cuts [for lunch]; cooked ham, liver pate, large amounts of meat, I haven’t seen anything like it in many, many years. We also had lunch arranged for us when I worked at Nature and Youth (Nature og Ungdom) twenty years ago. There, we occasionally had cold cuts, but in very small amounts, because meat eating was frowned upon

This recollection illustrates that the normative accountability of eating at work differed from what she was previously socialized into. Indeed, meat carried vastly different connotations here compared to that of a former, more meat skeptical, workplace. Also different to other social spaces she currently navigates on a frequent basis, for instances, friend groups. Intriguingly, despite the initial experience of shock and disbelief, Emma steadily adopted the normalised doings of her colleagues. Nowadays, Emma seems somewhat socialized into the current ways of eating at work. Despite the availability of non-meat alternative eating, our interview revealed that she typically eats meat several times a week without thinking too much about it. Her explanation convey that she largely follows what her co-workers do. When talking about the influence of eating amongst meat-eating colleagues, Emma notes that ‘they appreciate cold meats, so its vastly available […] when I see them prepare a sandwich with meat, it’s easy to just imitate that’.

In Emma’s day to day life, these different normatized food engagements do not conflict to the point of one cancelling out the other. Rather, they seem to exist side by side without much conscious distress or ambivalence. In other words, she carries different ways of
going about eating, performed fittingly across different contexts. Fascinatingly, due to request made by Emma, her workplace now facilitate more vegetarian eating at lunch by serving up different vegan-spread, however, Emma herself do not use it, and continue to engage in meat-eating at work. This is interesting on several levels. The act of requesting the facilitation of vegetarian eating, is not necessarily surprising because the action seem to align well with Emma’s omnivorous, pro-vegetarian dispositions, described in chapter 5. Moreover, it is a good example of how personal motivations and intentions may not align with behavior, in how Emma admits to not using these spreads herself, but rather continue to eat meat. It illustrates the significance of the practical theoretical idea that acts are never determined ex ante, but by the coming together of the actor and the extant practice (Schatzki 2002, 230-231). In this case, it entails that the omnivorous dispositions and understandings of non-meat eating as valued, which Emma carries, are not enough to guarantee a non-meat performance, because the practice of eating at work, the norms and materials involved, strongly guides her towards meat eating. Hence, this represents a particularly illustrative case for how values may not align with action, what the ABC-model advocates would claim to be a value-action-gap (Shove 2010).

What’s particularly interesting is seeing how some normative ways of doing become habitulized, and tacitly performed, as in the case of Emma’s meat eating at work. Yes, when first encountering this meaty environment, reflexivity kicked in, however when Emma reflects back, worried of social disapproval and concerned about ‘fitting in’ she kept her opinions to herself; ‘I don’t want to come into that space as a new employee and start moralizing (drive med pekefinger)’. Rather than going against the ‘stream’, she swam with it. Nowadays, her meaty doings at work do not seem to be one of much reflection or anxieties, but rather a result of having habitulized the normative doings of eating at work.

While the story above is unique for Emma, it represents a common finding across many of my informants. The normalization of non-meat-eating and meat-eating existed side by side, in everyday life and my informants tacitly adapted their performance accordingly. For instance, Ylva, a colleague of Emma, followed similar patterns of fluid eating, habitually performing meat eating at work, while tacitly performing non-meat eating in other social sets. While Emma and Ylva both carried intentions of meat reduction, they both seem habituated into doing eating as aligned with shared conventions at work.

The sense of implicitly and fluidly mounting eating performances appropriate to context, and its significances for meat avoidance, was particularly illustrative in Anna’s negotiating of what to eat at two different social barbeque events:
Question: What about last time you went to a barbeque, what did you eat?

Anna: It was at the summer party of our housing co-operative (boretslaget), we all did a barbeque together. We grilled sausages.

Question: What do you think would have happened if you brought vegetables to grill?

Anna: I don’t think there is a social pressure to eat hot dogs, it’s more that… it’s easy and risk-free. You cannot go wrong with hot dogs. I know how to grill hot dogs. However, if [my workplace] hosted a barbeque-party I would not bring hot dogs.

Question: Why is that?

Anna: Because people at [my workplace] do not eat meat.

Question: Are you sure about that?

Anna: I mean… I’m not sure, maybe they do, I just feel like hot dogs are so default… hot dogs are so ‘default’ at a housing co-operative party, if I would have brought some kind of fancy vegetable thing, I feel like that would have been like saying ‘look at me, look what I have made’ … I don’t know, sausages are somehow completely neutral, it is completely neutral, it says nothing about us, it is just sausages.

What these stories above so aptly illustrate is that the performance of meat reduced diets is both enabled and complicated by the ‘normative accountability’ (Rouse 2007) of practice, which may well vary markedly from one social space to another.

6.2.2. Drawn towards normative ways rather than implementing personal values

These findings ultimately suggest that what is considered an acceptable performance of eating varies between social sets and across occasion, representing distinctive normativized templates for behaviour, which my informants tacitly and explicitly adapt to. While performing normativity describes the process in which people are continuously and instinctively drawn towards mounting performances in line with the normative accountability of practice, I have drawn up the notion of performing fluid normativity to describe the inherent flexibility in effectively molding behavior fittingly across different normative contexts. Since implicit performances of normativity are enabled by the habituation of practical routines shaped by the socio-material environment in which they are born, setting and enclosed norms seem to be of great significance in terms of enabling or complicating meat reduced diets. In other words, context often seem more potent in directing performances of eating - and hence the amount of meat consumed - compared to personal values or intentions regarding meat reduction. This might be particularly true for meat reducers; seeing that they carry the understanding of meat as appropriate to consume, their ‘choices’ to eat or abstain from meat seem particularly dependent on what the context ascribe as appropriate.
This empirical observation might help us make further sense of some tendencies described in chapter 4. Nina and Egil, the two informants with the most meat dependant diets, was also by far, to a lesser degree surrounded by meat reducing friends or family. While Egil’s pro vegetarian daughter, seemed to have influenced his eating behaviour on some few occasions, or at least introduced the idea of vegetarian eating as appropriate, most performances of eating appeared to be performed in a meat-normalized social context. Nina seemed to completely lack friends and or family that valued such engagements, as the only informant in my sample. Her case is in many ways an outcast amongst my meat-reducing practitioners, in that for her, ‘vegetarian eating’ was disregarded as an idea altogether. The rest of my informants regularly encounter or engaged in social contexts wherein vegetarian eating was considered ordinary or at least a satisfactory performance of eating. Most of them encounter meat reduction as a valued engagement on a regular basis, which seems to allow for the uptake of meat reduced diets in the first place. The observation that my informants often perform habitualized normativity, thus, strengthen the claim made in chapter 4; that people are drawn to the idea of meat reduction because the idea is increasingly normalized and valued in their social circles.

This is particularly well expressed in my interview with Ylva:

Question: Is there a lot of people around you who attempt to reduce their consumption of meat?
Ylva: Yes, I do feel that many in my circle of friends do it. I feel like it is something one is conscious of and which we talk about.

Question: Does that effect your choices?
Ylva: Yes, I do think so.

Question: In what ways?
Ylva: It becomes normalized […] it becomes the culture which surrounds me. What you eat, what you think, or what you value, is influenced by colleagues, friends and family… people who I am close, who I like and who I agree with on many other topics. It sort of becomes an authority… an influence… If a friend of mine, which I see as a reasonable and smart, enlightened person, who I like, love and trust… if she shares these opinions about meat, then, that effects [me]. Then I reflect; ‘yes, she’s probably right about that’ and so, I don’t need to read up on everything. My circle of friends simply confirms that this is correct, without me going into depth, or without me needing expert knowledge about these issues.

Ylva’s account contradicts the idea that more information is the remedy towards meat-reduced diets and more generally challenge common notions about behaviour change following ABC-model thinking (see Shove 2010). Indeed, Ylva do not engage in meat reduction on the basis of explicit search for improvement. She does not collect information to inform how to implement
some unique values and aims born in mind to best implement meat reduction. Rather, her project of meat reduction is more a matter of passively absorbing the norms and conventions in her social network and synchronize her sayings and doings accordingly – a description which seems fittingly for several of my informants’ accounts. This finding resonate well with the practice theory conceptualizes of behaviour as driven by ‘passive monitoring’ rather than ‘calculated acts’ (Warde 2016). Following the findings presented here - which suggest that performances of eating often intuitively conform to different norms across different social sites – place further emphasis on the importance of context in enabling or complicating meat reduction.
6.3. Attempts at re-crafting performances: possibilities and limitations

In this last section, I build on the previous analysis and bring in some additional material to demonstrate how my informants sometimes succeeded in reducing or avoiding meat consumption. In such cases their intention and efforts need to be understood as embedded in and bounded the ‘fields of possibilities’ (Heisserer and Rau 2017) that practices draw up.

6.3.1. Intentionally acting on meat reduction

As illustrated in the previous chapter, the findings from this thesis suggest that much eating is habitually enacted and that habituated performances of normativity often take precedence over the intentional implementation of personal aims. Nevertheless, the findings also show that the participants of this study are able to reflect on and actively change their ways of eating. While the findings suggest that my informants often repeat previously adopted ways of normative doings, they do not act as robots which simply replay past performances or surrender completely to the social norms which surround them. The interviews revealed several examples of the purposeful re-crafting of practice, many of which has been presented throughout the previous chapters of this thesis. For instance, informants substitute meat from meaty dishes, they select vegetarian dishes when eating out and some learn new ways to cook. Indeed, they actively attempt to perform meat reduction and they do so in their own unique ways. Hence, Schatzki’s (1996, 2002) description of people as active and unique performers of practice, from the theoretical chapter, seem fitting.

While analysing performances of eating through a practice lens put ‘emphasis on the effortless exercise of judgement in the moment’, it does not ‘deny the ubiquity of mental reflection’ or intentional acts (Warde 2016, 143). A practice approach acknowledges people’s capacity to reflect on and revise their doings when conditions that enclosed previously appropriate performances change (Warde 2016, 142 - 146). Indeed, my informants review their past performances of eating and plan to change them as meat consumption is increasingly problematized and vegetarian-eating increasingly valued – signalled to them through the public cultural environment and behaviour of acquaintances (see chapter 4). In fact, it has been suggested elsewhere that when food consumption is broadly contested, routine ways of eating might be particularly accessible for personal revision (Halkier 2010), which seems to be the case for my informants, at least to a certain degree. Nevertheless, as Warde (2016) notes, ‘theories of practice are here distinctive (...) because the thinking involved is considered to be rooted in and circumscribed by the procedures and preoccupations associated with the
orchestration of performances’ (143). From a practice perspective, we understand the personal reflection and intentional acts involved in my informants’ efforts to reduce meat consumption as embedded in, occurring as part of and restricted by the performance of practice. A recap of the findings presented above help to clarify the significance of this claim: First, adopting the project of doing meat reduction is interpreted as recruitment to a collective undertaking, made possible by changes to the conditions which surrounds my informants. Simply put, the venture of doing meat reduction certainly seems encouraged or inspired by the milieu in which they live. Second, the ways in which people think they may act on these motivations are made possible but also limited by the competence and understandings they carry, adopted from previous engagement in practice. Hence, their bodies only allow certain ways of doing meat reduction. Third, the socio-material environment in which the potential performances of meat reduced diets are embedded, draw up limited possible ways of doing meat reduction. To be more precise, the coming together of meat accustomed bodies (chapter 5.1) meat inducive environments (5.2), ‘meaty norms’ (5.3), the meaty ‘needs’ of other people (5.4) and the dependence on meaty convenience (6.1), makes meat reduction a difficult undertaking. When my informants actively take part in the re-interpretation of eating, they do so while embedded in this context. Their negotiations, regardless of how conscious they may be, are rooted in and limited by a narrowed ‘field of possibilities’ (Heisserer and Rau 2017), allowing some doings and inhibiting others. It is within these limits that intentions might manifest – sometimes as creative solutions to challenges that different practices draw up. In the following I present two examples of such ‘solutions’ which work to illustrate 1) my informants’ active role in the re-crafting of performances, 2) how the implementation of intentional efforts needs to be understood as embedded in and restricted by the possibilities which practices draw up and 3) how this prefiguration of agency permits a restricted sense of ingenuity, allowing some solutions while discouraging others.

6.3.1.1. **Example 1: selecting dishes allowing for meat avoidance while upholding social harmony and appropriate conduct.**

As we saw in chapter 5, aligning performances with the internal teleoaffective structure of domestic eating often involved synchronizing performances with the dispositions of kids and/or spouse. Cooking alternative dishes was not considered a practical or socially doable option, and so, meat eating was often commenced as an indirect outcome of the inclinations and needs of household members. Interestingly though, some informants found solutions to this challenge in the cooking of specific dishes that allowed for meat eating and non-meat eating to take place.
inside the same meal. For instance, Sverre did so by cooking up what he calls ‘wraps’ – a dish served with multiple ingredients, were each of the ‘diners’ builds her/his own wrap in the proses of dining. This allowed him to commence meat reduction without breaking with the normative accountability of dining in at home. To put this into context, the following account reiterate some of Sverre’s sayings from chapter five:

Sverre

While for her (referring to his wife) […] it means a lot that we can eat the same food when we eat together. Or if she’s cooking something, it means a lot to her that I can take part in enjoying that food. So, when I suddenly said: ‘No need to make steak for me, I can just take some of that mushroom stew […]’, she felt pretty upset about it. Her experience of making two different dishes was that we did not eat together. That she would eat her meal and I would eat my meal. […] If you are eating out at a restaurant, then you could perhaps do so, but at home, it is so important to share the meal.

Sverre continued:

Sverre

When I make wraps, I cook up some meat for her to eat, which works as a good solution.

Question: So, when you eat wraps, you keep the sense of eating together, while still eating different ingredients?

Sverre

Yes, it works like that. And when it is appropriate to eat meat, I will join in on that.

Similar findings can be observed across different informants and different meal-occasions. Dishes with buffet-like eating (like tacos or tapas) or dishes allowing easy meat to meat-replacement substitution (e.g., burgers) or specific practices (ordering take-away, eating out and barbecuing) often allowed for the performance of meat-avoidance and meat-eating to play out inside the confines of the same meal occasion, without losing the sense of sharing and togetherness. Ordering different dishes when doing take-out or eating out was considered as part of the shared experience and hence also considered appropriate. In other words, these dishes offered social solutions because they enabled meat-eating and vegetarian eating to exist side by side without sacrificing the significance of meal sharing. They were also deemed practically doable because their preparation was considered convenient, as opposed to cooking up two different meals.

On the contrary, other dishes did not allow for meat eating and non-meat eating to take place side by side. For instance, it was not appropriate to cook up one vegetarian stew and one meaty stew, because it would no longer be considered as sharing the same meal. Simply excluding the meat from a dish considered meat-dependent, like steak, was also not considered an acceptable social solution on similar grounds, as illustrated by Sverre’s account above.
6.3.1.2. Example 2: ‘Buying’ non-meaty routines: solving the need for mundane effectiveness
As previously noted, most of my sample rarely engage in the learning of new dishes due to time-issues or the uncertainty of social implementation. Thus, the preparation of new dishes was often disregarded as a possible avenue for meat reduction. Interestingly though, some of my informants use web-based-delivery services, like that of Kolonial as a convenient way to pursue meat reduction through the preparation of new dishes. Here, dishes are presented in a pre-fixed package, pairing recipes with a pre-fixed shopping list. Like a flat packed furniture from Ikea, essential components and instructions for how to put them together into a meaningful whole (dish) are just a few keystrokes away and may be delivered at your door the following day:

Question: Is there a lot of planning that goes into shopping for food, are there regular dishes you shop for?
Anna: there are some dishes we cook on a regular basis, but it’s not a fixed schedule. If we order [...] from ‘Kolonial’, then there are some dishes that… ‘ok, we’ll have one of those, and then one of those and one of those’. We also buy dishes suggested by Kolonial, which makes it very, very easy. They have lots of vegetarian dishes, so it's very easy.

Question: Could you elaborate?
Anna: On Kolonial.no you can choose fixed recipes based on different qualities, for example you can sort based on child friendly dishes, or time-saving dishes, or vegetarian… then you press a button, and all the ingredients are added to the shopping cart. […]

This demonstrates how similar services may better enable novel ways of non-meat eating. My findings suggest that people may engage more heavily in the making of new dishes if it is made more practically and socially feasible. Such services save time by suggesting recipes and putting together all the ingredients for you, while representing socially approved ways of eating by categorizing dishes under ‘child friendly’ (barnevernsling), ‘weekday (hverdag) or ‘fast dinners’ (raske middager) (Oda n.d.). In essence, it may represent the purchase of a scripted practical routine; involving pre-fixed understandings of proper cooking, inbuilt competence and required materials. My findings suggest that the ease and time-efficient qualities of such services may expand people horizons of meat reduced ‘do-abilities’ (Halkier 2010) by equipping consumers with a potentially larger arsenal of approaches to non-meat eating.

6.3.2. Non-meat routines: Gradual habituation versus limitations
If we subscribe to the notion that habituation is the standard mode of eating and that people most often ‘eat in a state of distraction’ (Warde 2016, 102), it follows that establishing non-
meat routines are central for the long-term success of meat avoidance. Although the findings here are limited the material may suggest something about the possibilities and limitations of intentionally establishing non-meat routines.

6.3.2.1. Gradual habituation of non-meat routines
In the same way that my informants carried meat-heavy routines, they also carried non-meat routines. Sometimes, habitual meat avoidance was simply the result of habituated non-meat performances tacitly enacted in everyday life:

Sigrid: I often eat cheese on crispbread or cereal in the mornings... but I do not reflect on it, it's probably become a habit, that's how I think I have been eating for a very long time.

More interestingly though, some instances of non-meat eating seemed to be the result of a once intentionally commenced routine, gradually habitualized to the point that meat-reduced performances transpired without much thought. For instance, Sigrid, who tried to avoid meat when eating her everyday work-lunch, now performed non-meat eating without much reflexivity:

Question When you eat at work, relive it from start to end, is there any moment where you reflect: 'today I will not eat meat' or does it just happen so to speak?

Sigrid: No, I don't think about it. The only time I think about it is if it's a warm meal [with meat] that looks very tempting, and the [vegetarian] alternatives looks less appealing, then I might. But I never reflect; 'now I'm going to eat'... it just goes automatically (det er helt innarbeidet)

As Sigrid’s case illustrates, routines may indeed be established by intention. While the knee-jerk actions often referred to as habit is typically understood to be largely mindless and unavailable for planned modification, the practice theoretical emphasis on routines leave some room for ‘choice’ or intention. Following theories of practice, routines may be interpreted as ‘decomposed plans initially intentionally established, and subsequently followed because they express and meet the purposes that caused their adoption’ (Warde 2016, 127, emphasis added). For new habiutations to form, performances need to prove successful in the sense of delivering a practically and socially acceptable outcome, or else they are abandoned (Warde 2016, 137). Indeed, Sigrid’s initial intentions to not eat meat at work, seemed to have formed a new habituation as an outcome of repeated successful non-meat performances. The result was sustained, largely uninterrupted, reproduction of non-meat eating at work, not needing...
deliberation or cognizant effort. A general observation across my informants is how once intentional efforts to avoid meat had become sedimented into tacit routines. For instance, how Ylva once decided to cook up tacos without meat which eventually become the new normal. Or how Mikkel’s re-arranging of an established ‘chicken tandori’ routine, substituting chicken with tofu, had re-routinized meal preparation practices: ‘it has become a routine. If I don’t have plans on a Saturday’s, I’ll make myself a ‘Chicken Tandoori (referring to the vegetarian version), and so I have to visit specific stores to source out tofu’. The ‘Tofu-tandori’ was nowadays routinely prepared and consumed on a weekly basis. When new non-meat doings were successfully repeated over time and sedimented into taken for granted routines, they seemed to have become deeply ingrained into everyday life, almost like second nature. As the above examples illustrate, such doings may be mechanically performed on a day-to-day basis or ingrained in a more or less fixed repertoire of frequently prepared dishes. These findings strengthen Mylan’s (2018) suggestion that ‘[a] change to the established repertoire, in favour of less meat-based meals, is thus more likely to be a stable, longer term change—and therefore has important implications for sustainable consumption’.

It is important to note that the common denominator across instances of successfully establishing non-meat routines across my sample was a stable enabling environment. For instance, Sigrid’s non-meat eating at work was enabled by the continuous availability of vegetarian servings. Note how she claims that reflexivity may kick in only when external conditions change in ways that qualify meat-eating more sensible than vegetarian eating. For Mikkel, mainly performing solo-eating, free from the social sanction of kin, his conditions allow the learning and habituation of new dishes, while Aurora managed to establish a new dish in her repertoire based on vegetarian-nuggets because it was made available in the supermarket, it fitted inside her cooking competences, allowed for convenience and accepted by her kids and partner.

### 6.3.2.2. Limitations to attempts at changing up routines

While my informants seemingly manage to establish some new non-meaty routines, it is important to point out that changing up routines or establishing new ones do not come across as a straightforward endeavour. More importantly, the process often presents itself as one that is beyond the control of my informants.

Let us reiterate and specify two central notions about the concept of routine. As with all behavior, (1) the formation of routines is always embedded in a context of existing bodily, social and material ‘prefiguration’s’ (Schatzki 2002, 225) and (2) for routines to be established
they need to be repeated and proven successful over time for new habituations to form (Warde 2016). These practice theoretical ideas implies that the establishment of routines are never solely of individual free will. There are two main theoretical explanations for this, which was described in the theoretical chapter. First, is the emphasis on how social history’s structure future doings, through previously acquired bodily dispositions. Second, is the emphasize on how socio-material contexts prefigure and bound individual agency. Hence, the formation of eating-routines is always an emergent result of what has come before and cannot be completely re-invented (Warde 2016, 145).

Furthermore, some routines seem so taken for granted that their performance is not challenged. In this thesis, alterations to specific procedures of great social and practical significance seems non-negotiable as illustrated by the eating of meats for Christmas or the many convenient meaty routines which make everyday life manageable. Additionally, some strong habits of meat eating appear virtually hidden from view, ‘not easily accessible to consciousness or planned alteration’ (Warde 2016, 127). The use of cold cuts or meat-based spreads on sandwiches (‘brødskive med pålegg’) represents a repeated example of such, across my informants’ accounts.

Moreover, the nature of habituation further complicates attempts at intentionally establishing new routines or changing old ones. There is a likelihood that attempts at non-meat eating will fail to establish as routines when re-embedded at every new occasion within sites that persistently script meat consumption as the easiest, proper and correct way to do eating. One thing is to successfully avoid meat eating on one-off occasion, but for habituations to form – to make the point one more time - an action needs to be successfully repeated over time. Thinking that new non-meat habituations will form in an environment that consistently prescribe the opposite seems optimistic. Indeed, attempting to deliberatively control the establishment of non-meat routines may thus prove futile. Some attempts of establishing new routines simply do not provide socially and practically satisfactory in the long run, and hence, return to default state. For instance, as illustrated by Anna’s attempt to serve her kids a vegetable based ‘liver-pate’-substitute (‘grønnsakspøtter’), which is eventually abandoned when kids return home with uneaten lunches several days in a row. Additionally, people may even adopt routines that contradicts their intention of doing meat reduction through complex processes of habituation which they seem to exert little control over. This is illustrated by the observation that Ylva and Emma habitualise normative ways of eating at the workplace.

Following the observation that the normalization of meat eating is inscribed in extant environment and dispositioned bodies, we might think of the process of intentionally changing
meaty routines as fighting a battle on two fronts. On one side, fighting personal dispositions and natures, not easily amendable by conscious alteration, and on the other, going against an extant environment that persistently encourage people to eat meat. In other words, the interdependent workings of bodily inclinations and a conducive extant environment may be understood as continuously pushing people towards previously adopted ways of meat-intensive-eating. Egil’s struggle to change his hot-dog eating routine ‘on the go’ prove an illustrative example. In the familiar situation of needing to eat on the way from one activity to another, his intuitive bodily cravings for hot dogs combined with a material foodscape that encourage hot dog eating, pushes him towards repeating what previously has been done; conveniently alleviating hunger by grabbing a hot dog from one of the many kiosks that sells one.

In short, the formation of routines is to a large extent outside the control of individual mentalities. Indeed, the ‘role for choice and [intentional] design’ that the concept of routine convey is only ‘minor’ (Warde 2016, 127).

6.3.3. Intentionally changing performances of eating: bounded creativity
As the above illustrate, people carry the capacity to innovate in practice, to find creative ways to fit newly adopted intentions of meat reduction inside the confines that practices draw up. Understanding this through a practice lens, suggest however, that the capacity to initiate change should not be misread as the free self-determination of individuals, but rather as inspired, empowered and constrained by practice. In other words, recognizing that people intentionally change their ways, need not follow a depiction of individuals as ‘free agents of choice and change’, as the ABC-model of behaviour contends (Shove 2010). Rather, my informant’s capability of initiating change appears largely enabled and constrained by practice. It follows that changing eating habits might only be understood as a process of modification (Warde 2016, 145), because ‘[e]ach new combination of elements and practices is in some sense an emergent outcome of those that went before’ (Shove et al. 2012, 125). This interpretation does not strip human actors of agency but illustrate peoples’ restricted capacity to drive change. It draws attention towards the agency of standards and norms inscribed in the past and current socio-material environments in which people live their lives and habituations are formed.

When my informants make attempts at carrying out newly adopted intentions of doing meat reduction, they seem to fight an uphill battle, because their past and present existence is embedded in the broad normalization of meat-intense-eating. Their agency inescapably confined within a world of possibilities outlined by a historically specific nexus of practices, which often define meat eating as the sensible thing to do. The description of practicing meat
reduction as ‘bounded creativity’ (Nicolini 2012) seems fitting – albeit in a broader interpretation than what was presented in chapter 4. Personal efforts at meat reduction are bounded, not only by restricted bodily understandings and competence, but also the socio-material environment in which the carrying out of these approaches are embedded, which outline their enactment as more or less appropriate and doable.
7. CONCLUSION
In this chapter I summarize the findings, place them in relation to the literature and suggest some political and practical implications of the study.

7.1. Meat reduction as rooted in and circumscribed by practice
In this thesis I have identified factors that enable and complicate efforts at doing meat reduction, using a practice theoretical framework and guided by the underlying question: How are efforts to reduce meat consumption in Norwegian households enabled or complicated by existing food practices?

I have done so by first answering why and how people perform meat reduction. The picture that emerged from the material is that recruitment to meat reduction is a collective undertaking, enabled by the social and material environment in which my informants live their lives. Here, social networks seem particularly salient in terms of recruiting people to do meat reduced eating. Additionally, the findings suggest an increased acceptance and endorsement of meat reduced eating infused into the public cultural environment. This may imply that the idea of moderating meat consumption is also inspired more indirectly and subtly through observable signs and sayings in the socio-material environment.

This study has not interpreted recruitment to meat reduction as a personal project informed by individuals who simply choose to act on personal intentions based on information they gather. Rather, recruitment to meat reduction has been considered as a more complex process of people adapting to clues and cues in the cultural environment, the behaviours of friends, family and colleagues. Hence, the findings do not support the depiction of flexitarianism as a deliberate pursuing of identity and lifestyle (See Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1270). Instead, the findings support a portrayal of intentionality/recruitment to meat reduction as a matter of conforming to collectively shared ideas of meat reduction as increasingly valued and appropriate.

The varying approaches to meat reduction that the informants carry out appear to be initiated by the motivations they hold and guided and circumscribed by their dispositioned understandings and bodily competences. The pre-dispositioned bodily capacities to act on meat reduction made the material resonate with the notion of ‘practicing as bounded creativity’ (Nicolini 2012, 225). In other words, the possible ways the informants may intentionally change their ways of eating appears to be bounded by normative ways of thinking and doing – for instance, their understandings of what counts as a ‘proper meal’ or the available bodily cooking procedures they have at their disposal. The analysis suggested that my informants’ restricted
competences, coupled with the need for mundane effectiveness in the management of everyday life, rendered the reliance on familiarized ways to eat as the most sensible, and hence common, way to perform meat reduction. Essentially, giving attention to the relevance of social networks in recruiting people to do meat reduction and the role of publicly acquired bodily competences in shaping the nature of meat reduction, chapter 4 emphasised the importance of socialisation in enabling meat reduced eating and the shape it may take.

To answer the second sub-question, what factors complicate meat reduction in Norwegian households, the thesis honed in on the three pillars of practices, in chapter 5, to demonstrate how the agency in bodies, material environment and social setting complicates meat reduction in various ways. Socialized into meat-intense ways of eating, my informants carry ‘meaty’ tastes, beliefs, competences and habits – complicating meat avoidance in the present. They struggle to avoid the use of meat because it is understood to be an integral component of specific cherished dishes or fundamental in the carrying out of specific social meal occasions. Meat was also valued for its taste, making meat-eating difficult to scrap because it fulfilled bodily sensory cravings. Additionally, meat is understood to be nutritionally dense and omitting it from one’s diet may, go counter to ideas about healthiness, at least for some of the informants. Moreover, some meaty doings escaped mindful confrontation altogether. Indeed, it seemed that the use of certain meats, particularly cold-cuts or meaty spreads, were concealed by the somewhat automated and mechanical nature of specific mundane routines, such as preparing a packed lunch for one’s kids. Furthermore, the material foodscape in which their performances are embedded often scripts meat-eating as normal, valued and appropriate and the findings suggest that this complicates possible ways of doing meat reduction. Sometimes, as in making non-meat eating the less appropriate, less attractive and less convenient ‘choice’. Other times the lack of alternative ways of eating seemed to qualify meat avoidance close to impossible, leaving the informants no other practical or socially doable ‘choice’ than to eat meat.

When negotiating meat reduction across the social organization of meal occasions, it appeared that the avoidance of meat was complicated by whom one eats with. When doing domestic eating the ‘meaty’ dispositions and needs of partner and/or children often rendered meat eating sensible. When providing domestic hospitality, the ‘meaty’ dispositions of guests justified serving meaty dishes. When eating as guests, most informants would not ask the host to cater for their wish to avoid meat eating. Rather, they simply ate what was served. In short, the informants seemed more concerned with orchestrating performances that synchronized to the dispositions of others rather than what harmonized with their goal of doing meat reduction.
The analysis suggests that such behaviour follows the preoccupation of aligning procedures with the normativity of practice and the accountabilities therein, in order to sustain social harmony and avoid social reproach. Hence, this study echo Mylan’s (2018) observation that ‘prospect of social sanctions, in the form of the disappointment of others [and] unsatisfying participation in social occasions, […] effectively curb[] the enactment of meat reduction’ (12).

While separating bodily, material and social elements has helped to zoom in on specific factors that complicates meat reduction, the analysis has emphasized how elements simultaneously and interdependently work to qualify performances. The separation of elements might make sense in theory, but not in ‘practice’, so to speak. Understanding them as independent would run the risk of re-introducing behaviourist understandings of consumption and miss the novel ways in which practice theory may help advance the debate on meat consumption. Essentially, when bodily, social and material elements come together and conjointly qualify possible paths of eating, conceivable ways of doing meat reduction seems greatly constrained. The informants’ search for convenient ways to perform eating, presented in chapter 6.1, provided an illustrative cross cutting example of how said elements come together and complicate meat reduced eating. The analysis suggest that the dependence on timesaving and hassle-free ways to eat in the management of everyday life, coupled with a meat-intense repertoire of convenient cooking and a material foodscape that heavily facilitates convenient meat-eating pushed my informants towards meat dependent convenience.

While the participants manage to relive and reflect on their many past performances of eating, occasionally offering detailed justifications of why they do as they do, the findings presented in this thesis suggest that much eating-behaviour is of habitual character. This implies that instances of eating often follow socially rehearsed responses to clues and cues in the extant environment. It is suggested that many performances of eating rather instinctively conform to the conventions of the social site in which they are embedded, made possible by preceding processes of socialisation and habituation. As exemplified in chapter 6.2, the informants often intuitively imitate what the specific site prescribes as appropriate ways of eating – even if doing so goes counter to ‘personal’ aims of reducing meat consumption. The importance accredited to processes of habituation and socialisation put further emphasis on the agency of contextual norms in guiding what people eat and hence enabling or complicating meat reduction.

Nonetheless, the findings also suggest that the informants were able to revise and actively change their ways of eating, so that their consumption of meat was successfully reduced. Simply put, intentional efforts to avoid meat consumption was sometimes implemented, sometimes not. Occasionally, efforts proved successful other times less so. Some
informants retold having successfully re-crafted several performances; others seem to make few changes. What the discussion of this thesis has attempted to highlight is that the informants’ intentions and efforts at reducing meat consumption – regardless of their natures – appears to be empowered and bounded by the organizing principles of practice – which allow for meat reduction, yet only in specific and often limited ways.

Building further on the observation that most everyday eating is enacted in a habituated state, chapter 6.3 explicitly discussed what enables and complicates the establishing of new, or the changing of old, routines more specifically. In essence, the findings suggest that people may successfully establish new non-meat habits if embedded within an incessantly empowering environment. Nonetheless and importantly, the discussion proposes that the notion of individuals establishing non-meat routines by personal intention have some apparent limitations. First, founded within pre-defined paths of possibilities, the emergence of routines is always somewhat constrained – an emergent product of past deeds. Second, despite acknowledging how changes in the context which enclose eating may bring doings out of the habitual into the reflexive and hence open them up for modification, the social significance of many meat-based routines leaves them un-challenged. Third, and perhaps most importantly, there is a likelihood that attempts at non-meat eating will fail to establish as routines when re-embedded at every new occasion within sites that persistently script meat consumption as the easiest, proper and correct way to do eating.

There is and evident tension between newness and boundedness across the participants efforts at reducing meat consumption. They manage to creatively change things up and do things differently, yet their intentions and efforts are visibly constrained. The envisioning of how meat reduced diets may be implemented are bounded by their dispositioned understandings and bodily competences. Efforts at acting on their ideas might be complicated by stubborn habits, rendered infeasible by social responsibilities or undoable by the lack of material affordances. Essentially, these findings fundamentally draw up efforts at practicing meat reduction as bounded creativity (Nicolini 2012). Simply put, by depicting efforts at meat reduction as embedded and circumscribed by practice, individual agency appears greatly delimites.

7.2. The significance of conventions
In general, the finding presented in the above suggest that the factors which enable or complicates meat reduction are typically of the same origin. My informants struggle to avoid meat eating when the social site script meat eating as appropriate, while eating across pro-
vegetarian sites effectively enable non-meat eating. Indeed, this thesis attributes a twofold significance to the importance of governing conventions across social networks and physical settings, in both recruiting individuals to take on the project of meat reduction and playing a decisive role in the success of its ‘implementation’. Similarly, previously acquired bodily competences enable or complicate meat reduction in different ways. As the findings here suggest, some informant’s omnivorous tastes seem to allow for a broader range of ways to enact meat reduction, compared to the few that displayed scepticism towards vegetarian eating.

Whether bodily competences, social settings or the physical environment hinder or permit non-meat eating appear to be largely dependent on present and past conventions. Norms are embodied and carried into social interaction by bodies, and they are scripted into the material environment and systems of provision, which they once helped shape. In essence then, this thesis suggests that what truly matters in enabling or complicating meat reduced eating are processes of normalisation and standardization – how collective conventions are established, reproduced and sustained (Shove 2003) – of which individuals assert little power.

Compared to the individualistic literature on meat consumption and meat reduction, the findings presented here accredit more significance to the role of context in structuring instances of eating. More importantly, treating conventions not as separate from individuals (Shove 2010 1279), not merely as context or ‘external constraints on consumer choice’ (Austgulen 2014, 49), but as embodied and (often) tacitly reproduced by them, this thesis suggests that eating is in large pushed beyond the control of individual mentalities.

By accrediting much agency to the implementation of rehearsed practical routines and less to personal deliberation in moments of eating, the findings here support the depiction of habits as one of the key barriers towards reducing meat consumption (e.g., Graça, Oliveira, and Calheiros 2015, Lea, Crawford, and Worsley 2006). Furthermore, that the establishment of non-meat routines - for instance as habituated dish-repertoires (Mylan 2018, 8) - are crucial in enabling less meat intensive eating in the long term. Importantly though, highlighting processes of habituation in shaping routines, intricately reliant on the socio-material environment in which they are formed, stress the normative and collective formation of eating-habits. Thus, suggesting a need to shift attention away from ‘the possibility of changing personal habits’ (Graça et al. 2015, 88 emphasis added) towards the possibility of changing collective ones. Accordingly, it appears more convincing to depict the socio-material environment and the conventions it subtends as the main culprit. Thus, it is more precise to say that the findings here support the argument that a change in social norms is essential to facilitate for a dietary shift towards less meat eating (See e.g., Macdiarmid et al. 2016), which may open up for the
reinterpretation of practice and a ‘new conformity’ to establish, such that ‘new habituations’ (Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1273) may form. However, the findings do not support the depictions of individual as efficient drivers of this change (Stoll-Kleemann and Schmidt 2017, 1273), which seem to ignore how individual intentions, choices and habits are themselves rooted in, circumscribed by - and hence; a product of - prevailing conventions. As such, the findings presented here calls for a shift away from individual attitudes and values towards the historically embedded and collectively guarded conventions of meat-intense eating, which acknowledge all actors that have a hand in reproducing standards of eating.

Ultimately, in relation to the broader field on sustainable consumption this research adds to the literature which highlight how, in the face of broader social, cultural and material constraints, even motivated individuals struggle to adopt more sustainable ways of doing (e.g., Isenhour 2010, Mylan 2018).

7.3. Practical and political implications

Viewing efforts of meat reduction through a practice theoretical lens stress how eating is of normative and collective nature. Treating unsustainable ways of eating as an individual problem, thus, appears both unfair and unproductive, instead, ‘responsibility should be seen as collective and distributed’ (Warde 2017, 198). The idea of distributed agency guides our attention towards all actors that influence the social coordination of eating. In different ways organisations, institutions and individuals influence what it means to eat properly, often by tacitly reproducing prevailing standards of eating, which materialize in the public cultural environment, which, as this thesis have illustrated exert power in guiding food choices. The range of actors that influence eating may be far and wide and some more obvious than others. For instance, as depicted above, restaurants come with meat eating scripts, while distribution services, like that of Kolonial outline proper dishes to specific meal occasions. Supermarkets help reproduce meat-eating as the proper way to do barbecuing (Rosenberg and Vittersø 2014, 46-47), while media support certain standards through the printing of recipes in magazines or the screening of cooking demonstrations. The seven-hour long television broadcast of the cooking of pork ribs, aired by the state-owned public broadcasting company Nrk (Nrk n.d.) every Christmas is a relevant example. It is important to note that, as with individuals, the operation of such actors is embedded in normative practices, entrenched in the inevitable and incessant reproduction of prevailing standards. Thus, change is unlikely to originate from profit-driven actors whose survival depends on providing services which fit with mainstream
cravings. Nonetheless, their influence on what is considered appropriate ways to eat need to be recognized.

A related implication is to acknowledge of how ‘systems of provision’ which connects meat-eating to the ‘production that makes it possible’ (Fine 2002, 79), help co-create demand (Rinkinen, Shove, and Marsden 2020). As described in a recent released climate target plan the Norwegian government assumes that a less meat dependent agronomy will follow as the agriculture sector respond to a decline in the demand of meat, following official nutritional recommendation (Klima- og miljødepartementet 2021). Besides overestimating the effectiveness of information in altering practice, the mainstream policy approach of predicting and providing for consumer demand, which depicts needs as ‘preceding the development of infrastructure’ (Coutard and Shove 2018, 20) - largely ignores how systems of provision help shape and sustain certain ways of eating. The action plan seems happily complicit to how current state priorities help promote the consumption of meat by supplying generous amounts of cheap meat to the market (Vittersø and Kjærnes 2015), or how the intense and broad marketing of low-priced meat towards the public incessantly encourage meat-eating and suggest new ways to enjoy it (Rosenberg and Vittersø 2014). Indeed, in summing up their research on the political economy of meat in Norway, Vittersø and Kjærnes (2015) contend that Norwegians’ increased hunger for meat throughout the last three decades has been heavily guided and shaped by political priorities and changes on the supply side, following the aim to increase the turnover and profitability of meat in order to protect Norwegian agriculture.

A political paradox appears. While the political justification for individualizing the responsibility of food related issues largely rests upon the argument that people must be free to eat what they please, current political priorities arguably help co-create meat-intense diets. Indeed, they have their hand in shaping a socio-material environment that often scripts meat eating as an easy and appropriate ‘choice’. As one of my informants fittingly commented:

Aurora: It is very skewed. If one is to choose freely, then the road needs to be free of hurdles, so that you are not pushed towards a situation where there are suddenly no alternatives around. For instance, I think that the information-office for milk and meat sponsor cooking in school […] through recipe booklets… I’m not sure, but, the state have at least a responsibility for a neutral… presentation or education, information and subsidy, at least a neutral starting point, which, I believe, is not the case today, when its veering towards the meat and milk part of agriculture. It [referring to the general context of eating] should at least be neutral, if not even promoting a more vegetarian approach [to eating].
When food choices are assumed to regularly originate from rehearsed responses to familiar signals in the exterior environment rather than the deliberation of personal values and motives, changing the environment in which action is embedded emerge as a more useful approach than trying to change the minds of individuals. Hence, considering the current government’s explicit aim to align people’s food ‘choices’ with national nutritional recommendations (Klima- og miljødepartementet 2021, 122), which include a lower meat intake, some policy measures emerge as more fruitful than others. The current strategy of changing people’s attitudes largely through information campaigns will likely do little to promote less meat eating, while changes made to existing systems of provision would likely be more productive. Indeed, ‘if people’s habits are formed in a material context, then its purposive design is a strong lever’ (Warde 2017, 199). A shift away from current political priorities which generate large quanta of cheap meat to the market would be a logical first step. Further, increasing taxes or constraining the advertisement of meat, as currently done with alcohol, could prove beneficial. Simultaneously, governments could encourage more vegetarian eating, by facilitating mainly for non-meat eating across eateries in the public sector or financially reward the production and development off vegetarian ready-made meals. Following the findings presented in chapter 6.2, the results from this study – of a rather narrow set of tastes – suggest that a focus on developing healthy non-meat convenience-meals could be beneficiary in a Norwegian context. Furthermore, changing of educational curricula and training could prove constructive, as a sort of purposeful training of bodies (Warde 2016, 130-134) from early age. The aim here is not to provide an exhaustive list of possible interventions, but to simply underscore the point that current information-based measures will prove ineffective without any radical changes to the socio-material environment in which eating is embedded.

7.3.1. Future prospects
The findings presented in the above suggest that a radical change towards meat reduced diets seems rather unlikely without any fundamental changes to the social, physical and economic structures that reproduce meat consumption as the appropriate, easy and cheapest way to eat. This thesis support Watson’s (2012) assumption that a momentum may form if more people do things differently. Indeed, the meat-reducing doings of my informants appear to trail an emergent social movement. As more people adopt flexitarian, vegetarian or vegan diets, the chance of recruitment to non-meat-eating increases. However, this tendency has yet to materialize substantially according to official numbers on meat consumption. The findings
presented in the above may indicate why that is, by drawing up barriers towards meat reduction that even committed and knowledgeable individuals fail to overcome.

The findings further illustrate how current social conventions and material environment, protected and reproduced by political priorities, organizations and institutions, hinder a significant reduction in meat consumption to follow from aggregated individual choices. Instead, assuming that behaviour has a normative and habitual foundation (Warde 2016, 2017) the thesis suggests that dietary changes towards less meat eating are likely to be slow and incremental rather than abrupt and probably only limited in the absence of regulative policy interventions. Different elements, like environmental prompts, embodied knowledge, social conventions and the mundane effectiveness provided by previously established routines, push people towards previously rehearsed ways of eating, rendering changes difficult. For meat accustomed bodies, this entails the reproduction of meat intense eating. Moreover, the current organization of practice, with meat inducive social, cultural and material scripts, seem to draw up rather narrow path of possible non-meat enactments allowing only for restricted modification. In essence, a social site which script meat eating as the sensible way to eat will likely keep reproducing meat intense diets if left to its own devices.

7.4. Reflections on the study and suggestions for future research
Through the use of in-depth interviews and diary entries, this thesis has offered insight into the experiences, approaches and challenges of nine Norwegian meat reducers. This approach has proven productive in providing some novel insight into what might enable or complicate efforts at doing meat reduction in Norwegian households. Some possible avenues for future research might complement these results. For instance, the findings presented here have only provided a time-bound snapshot of people’s efforts at performing meat reduction, and hence, cannot say much about how diets change over time. Studying efforts at meat reduction over a more extended period might provide valuable insight into how efforts at meat reduction develop and mature. Do people prove to be faithful carriers of meat reduced eating, or do their efforts fade with time and if so, why? Moreover, the findings presented here rest on a small samples size consisting mainly of highly educated, urban young adults. Studies researching efforts at meat reduction across a sample that include participants of rural residency, of lower education and both younger and elder population would supplement the findings here. Furthermore, comparisons between different socio-demographic segments of the population would also provide interesting avenues for research. For instance, a comparison across the rural-urban divide would perhaps help illustrate how different local conventions and material affordances
affect meat reduction. Finally, a comparison across younger and older segments of the population could for instance help illuminate differences in dispositioned tastes and how this shape attempts at doing meat reduction.
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## APPENDIX 1: Diary

### (A) MÅLTID:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># SPØRSMÅL</th>
<th>(1) Fyll inn her.</th>
<th>(2) Fyll inn her.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Type måltid? (frukost, lunsj, middag, mellommåltid etc.)</td>
<td>1. Frukost</td>
<td>1. Lunsj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hvor? (På arbeidsplass, hjemme, på restaurant etc)</td>
<td>2. Hjemme</td>
<td>2. På restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a Hvis utenfor hjemmet ; presiser evnt. anledning/kontext/situasjon.</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>2.a lunsj på jobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Hvis måltidet var ‘hjemmelaget’ - hvor lagde maten? (meg selv, venn, kjæreste, etc)</td>
<td>4.1 lagde selv</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Hvis du kjøpte måltidet ‘kommersielt’, hvor ble maten kjøpt? (kantine, koisk, restaurant etc.)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2 Villa Paradiso, Grunerløkka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.a Gitt at maten du spiste ble kjøpt av noen andre en deg selv, presiser dette:</td>
<td>4.2.a</td>
<td>4.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hva spiste du? (Generell beskrivelse; f.eks: salat, taco, brødskiver med pålegg, etc.)</td>
<td>5. Brødskiver med pålegg</td>
<td>5. Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a Presiser om måltidet inneholdt; kjøtt, fisk eller var vegetarisk/vegansk (presiser type kjøtt/fisk)</td>
<td>5.a Storke (svin)</td>
<td>5.a Vegetar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b Presiser eventuelt om du brukte en type kjøtterstatning (presiser type; burger, pølse)</td>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>5.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Refleksjoner eller kommentarer (valgfritt) 6 6

### (B) MATLAGING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># SPØRSMÅL</th>
<th>(1) Fyll inn her.</th>
<th>(2) Fyll inn her.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hvor? (egnet hjem, hos venn/venninne)</td>
<td>1. Hjemme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type måltid: (matpakke, middag)</td>
<td>2. Matpakke</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hva lagde du? (Generell beskrivelse; brødskiver med pålegg, pizza)</td>
<td>4. Brødskiver</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a Presiser om måltidet inneholdt; kjøtt, fisk, var vegetarisk eller vegansk.</td>
<td>4.a Kjøtt (leverpostei, type svin)</td>
<td>4.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b Presiser eventuelt om du brukte en type kjøtterstatning.</td>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>4.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Refleksjoner eller kommentarer (valgfritt) 5 5

### (C) HANDLING AV MAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># SPØRSMÅL</th>
<th>(1) Fyll inn her.</th>
<th>(2) Fyll inn her.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hvor? (navn på butikk)</td>
<td>1. Fiski</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type handling? (eksempel: planlagt ukes-handling, påfyll av ingredienser etc)</td>
<td>2. Handlet inn for hele uken</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presiser om du kjøpte kjøtt, hvilke type og ca mengde.</td>
<td>3. Svinekoteletter 500g</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presiser om du kjøpte kjøtt-erstatnings produkter , hvilke type og ca mengde (med type menes pølse, burger etc, ikke merke på produktet)</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Refleksjoner eller kommentarer (valgfritt) 5 5
APPENDIX 2: Interview guide

PART 1: INTRO

a) presentere meg selv og prosjektet
   o konsekvensen av å være med i prosjektet
   o muligens kobling opp mot forskingsprosjektet MEAT-igation, og konsekvensene for oppbevaring av data
b) hvordan jeg dokumenterer intervjuet (båndopptaker), hva som gjøres med datamateriale når prosjektet avsluttes
c) anonymitet
d) informere om rett til å avslutte intervjuet på hvilke som helst tidspunkt
e) antyde lengde på intervjuet

PART 2: GETTING TO KNOW THE PERSON

WHO?

1) Kunne du starte å fortelle lit om deg selv, din bakgrunn, familie, hvor du kommer fra og hva du gjør?
   ▪ (Navn, alder og fødselsted, bosituasjon, yrke og utdanning)

2) Hvis flere i husholdning: Kan du si litt om husholdningen? hvor lenge har dere bodd sammen/her?
   ▪ Barn (alder, skoletrinn/barnehage)

EVERYDAY ROUTINES AND PRACTICES (HVERDAGSVANER)

3) Fortell litt om hvordan en vanlig dag ser ut for deg/dere?

REFLECTIONS: ATTITUDES, VIEWS, MOTIVATION, AGENCY AND TASTE

Holdninger til mat

4) Hva betyr det for deg å spise riktig / hva tenker du er et riktig kosthold?
5) Hva et komplett måltid for deg? (Ingredienser, sammensetning, middagsmåltid)
   ▪ Hva med et middagsmåltid?

Holdninger til klimaendringer og bærekraft

6) Hvordan synes du det er å forholde seg til etiske valg i hverdagen? Eksempelvis det å ta klimavennlige valg? Tar du mye slike ‘valg’?

Ansvar og påvirkningskraft

7) Hvem tenker du har ansvaret for hva vi spiser og om hvorvidt dette er sunt, bærekraftig eller etisk produsert?
8) Hvor mye tror du individers (dine/husholdginens) valg kan påvirke den generelle samfunnsviklingen gjennom forbruk? Eksempelvis gjennom hva vi spiser?
**Hvis barn**
1) har du reflektert over miljøavtrykket til barnas diet?
2) Føler du ansvar for dette fotavtrykket?
3) Gjelder de motivene du har for eget kjøttforbruk også barna?
4) Gjør du aktive valg i hverdagen for at barna dine skal spise mindre kjøtt?

**HISTORICAL FOOD PRACTICES / CHANGES IN FOOD PRACTICES / FRACTURES**
9) Husker du hvordan måltidene foregikk i din familie når du var liten?
   - Hva spiste du/dere?
   - Hvilken posisjon hadde kjøtt i dette kostholdet?

10) Hvordan har dine matvaner endret seg over dit?
   - Stabilt, endret seg plutselig eller gradvis?
   - Hvis plutselig; hva tenker du var grunnen til dette?
   - Til hvilken grad har ditt forhold til kjøtt forandret seg over tid (helse, miljø, etikk)

**Hvilke elementer endres? Det materielle, meninger eller kompetanse?**

11) **Hvis småbarnsførepredre**; hvordan har det å få barn påvirket matvanene deres og spesielt målet om å redusere kjøtt-forbruket?

**MEAT AND CONSUMPTION**
12) Hva assosierer du med kjøtt / hva betyr kjøtt for deg?

13) Kan du gi et ca. estimat på hvor mye kjøtt du/dere spiser pr uke?
   - Hyppighet, mengde, type

14) Hvor mye kjøtt spiste du/dere før? (Før du evnt. valgte å redusere)

15) Hvorfor velger du å redusere kjøttforbruket?
   - Når bestemte du deg for dette?

16) Til hvilken grad føler du at du lykkes med å redusere kjøtt?

17) Gjør du forskjell på type kjøtt du helst spiser / helst ikke spiser?

**PÅVIRKNING**
18) Har du familie eller kjente som prøver å redusere kjøtt-forbruket?
   - Hvordan har dette påvirket deg?
19) Hvordan forholder du deg til medieoppslag og offentlige diskurser ang mat?

20) Hvordan forholder du deg til råd fra myndigheter?

**PART 3: GOING IN DEPTH; UNDERSTANDING MEAT CONSUMPTION AS PART OF FOOD PRACTICES**

**SHOPPING FOR FOODSTUFF (HANDLING)**

**Vaner/rutine:**
1) Kan du si litt om dine/deres mathandlings rutiner?
   - **Hyppighet**
     - Hvor ofte?
     - Bestemte dager?
   - **Hvor?**
     - hvilke butikker?
     - hvorfor akkurat denne/disse butikkene (Beviste valg, vane, spesiale ingredienser?)
   - **Når?**
     - når på dagen pleier du som regel å handle?
     - pleier det som regel å være i en del av andre ærend?

2) Til hvilke grad varierer sted, tid og hva du handler? (Faste rutiner eller høy variasjon?)
   - Har det alltid vært slik, eller har (vanene) endret seg?

3) **Hvis partner:** hvordan er arbeidsfordelingen i forhold til hvem som handler og varierer innholdet av kjøtt deretter?

**Planning / Strategy**
4) Til hvilke grad planlegger du handlingen? (handlelister, faste retter som handles inn, eller lite planlegging, vanebetinget)

5) Bruker du handling bevist som en strategi for å spise mindre kjøtt, evnt. hvordan?

**Challenges and experiences?**
6) Opplever du utfordringer ved å handle kjøttfritt når du er på restaurant, i kantine eller andre steder?

**What is bought / What is eaten?**
7) Hvor ofte kjøper du og tilbereder du enkeltstående kjøttvarer?

8) Hvor ofte kjøper du / spiser dere ferdig-mat/ferdig måltider fra butikk (f.eks: frossen pizza, pølser etc)
o Til hvilke grad lykkes du med å redusere kjøtt i slike måltider

9) Hvor ofte handler du/spiser du dere take-out og hva?
   o Til hvilke grad lykkes du med å redusere kjøtt i slike måltider

10) Kjøper du/spiser du ofte kjøtt-erstatningsprodukter?

COOKING AND DOMESTIC EATING

Måltider i heimen:
11) Kan du fortelle litt om hvordan måltider i hjemmet foregår?
   o Hvilke måltider konsumeres her?
   o Hvis flere: spiser dere som oftest sammen?

12) Er det uenighet i husstanden om hvor mye kjøtt som skal spises?
   o Hvordan kommer dere frem til enighet?
   o Hvilke utfordringer har du møtt på?

Matlaging:

13) Kan du fortelle litt om rutinene dine/deres med hensyn til matlaging?
   o Middagsplan?
   o Lager du mat som skal rekke i flere dager etc
   o Liker du å lage mat?
   o Hvor ofte lager du selv mat? Og hvem lager du til?
   o Hvis partner: lager dere mat sammen?

14) Hvordan pleier du å sette sammen et måltid? (Ingredienser).

15) Varierer bruk av kjøtt ettersom hvem du lager mat til? (smi; selv, med barn med partner, venninner, kolleger)

16) Hvis partner: hvordan er arbeidsfordelingen med tanke på hvem som lager mat? Hvordan bestemmes hva som blir spist? Og varierer innholdet av kjøtt deretter?

Reperatoire

17) Har du et repertoar med matretter som du ofte lager?
   o Eksempelvis taco, fiskepinner og spagetti (en gang i uken)

18) Når du lager mat; hvor ofte lager du fra oppskrift, fra minne eller improviserer?
   o Hvis improvisasjon; setter du sammen helt nye matretter eller er det variasjoner av typiske retter du allerede kan?
   o Hvis oppskrifter: hvor henter du de fra?
     o Følger du oppskrifter slavisk eller mer løst?
     o Hender det at du overstyrer oppskriften? Dvs. bytter ut en ingrediens med en annen? (Kjøtt med f.eks kjøtterstaning)

19) Hvor ofte lager du noe helt nytt som du aldri har laget før?
Kjøtt-reduksjon (strategi, erfaring og utfordringer)

20) Kan du si noe om hvordan du har forsøkt å redusere bruk av kjøtt i matlaging? Og eventuelle hvilke utfordringer du har møtt på?
   - Erstattes kjøttet?
   - Hva er kjøttet erstattet med? med kjøttersetning, eller andre proteinkilder?
   - hvor ofte bruker du kjøtt-erstatningsprodukter i matlaging?

21) Når du valgte å kutte ned på kjøtt; har du lært deg nye oppskrifter eller fortsatt å lage gamle retter?
   - byttet ut kjøtt med kjøttersetning, eller andre proteinkilder?
   - Bestemte retter? hvor avhengig er vedkommende av disse?

Hvis barn: Har matlaging endret seg etter du fikk barn

22) Kan du fortelle litt mer generelt om spise/måltids-rutinene dine (utover hjemmet)
   - frokost, lunsj, middag?
   - tid, faste rutiner.
   - forskjell helg/hverdag

23) Varierer kjøtt-konsumet ettersom hvor du spiser?

24) vil du si at dagboken du førte i forbindelse med dette prosjektet er representativt for en normal mat-uke?

‘Eating in’

25) Tenk tilbake på sist gang du hadde middagsgjester; hva serverte du?
   - Serverer du vanligvis kjøtt når du har gjester?
     - Familie-besøk
     - Vennebesøk
26) Hvis barn: hva serverer du i barnebursdag?
   o Kunne du tenkt å servere vegetarisk her?

‘Eating out’

27) Hvor ofte spiser du ute?
   o Hva, hvor?
   o Varierer konsum av kjøtt når du spiser utenfor hjemmet?

28) Hva spiser du vanligvis på arbeidsplassen i lunsjen? Kantine eller medbrakt?
   o Spiser du oftest med eller uten kjøtt her?
   o Hva med dine kolleger?

29) Hvordan har du opplevd det å prøve å spise mindre kjøtt når du spiser ute?
   o Hvordan varierer konsum av kjøtt fra når du spiser hjemme sammenlignet med når du spiser ute?
   o Tenker du at det gir mening å spise kjøtt i enkelte kontekster mens andre ikke?

30) Hva spiser du når du skal ut å kose deg?

31) Hva spiser du vanligvis til jul?
   o Kunne du tenkt deg å spise kjøttfritt i julen?

32) Hvis du deltok på noen julebord eller jule-avslutninger sist jul, kan du huske hva du spiste?
   o Kunne du tenkt deg å spise vegetarisk her?

33) Hva pleier du å grille og hva tenker du om å grille vegetarisk?
   o Hva grille du sist gang?

Eating on the go

34) Hender det ofte at du spiser på farten?

35) Kan du tenkte deg tilbake til siste gang du spiste et måltid på farten
   o Hva kjøpte du?

36) Hvordan syntes du det er å skulle spise kjøttfritt på farten? Har du møtt på noen utfordringer i den sammenheng?

PART 3: WRAPPING UP
1) Spør vedkommende generelt om utfordringer, strategier og erfaringer ved å redusere kjøttforbruk (som ikke er nevnt over)
2) Hvordan har du opplevd det å skulle redusere kjøttforbruket? Hva er vært vanskelig?
3) Er det noe du kommer på i hverdagen som gjør det vanskelig å unngå å spise kjøtt?
4) Er det noe du har lyst å legge til, snakke lit mer om eller noe vi ikke har vært innom som du føler det er viktig å få med seg?

Takk for deltakelse.
APPENDIX 3: Call for participants

DELTAKERE TIL FORSKNINGSPROSJEKT OM MATVANER OG KJØTTFORBRUK SØKES

I forbindelse med mitt masterprosjekt ønsker jeg å komme i kontakt med husholdninger eller individer som ønsker eller prøver å redusere sitt eget kjøttforbruk. Jeg vil gjerne snakke om dine/deres erfaringer og eventuelle utfordringer. Deltakelse i prosjektet innebærer å gjøre en enkel (ikke detaljert) loggføring av matvaner over syv sammenhengende dager (en uke) og deretter stille til et påfølgende intervju.

Jeg ser etter deg/dere som:

- bor i Oslo/Akershus
- ønsker eller forsøker å redusere sitt eget / husholdningens kjøttforbruk
  - i hvilken grad du spiser mindre kjøtt sammenlignet med tidligere, er ikke vesentlig
  - hvilke grunner du har for å redusere forbruket er heller ikke viktig
- du fører ikke en streng vegetarisk/vegansk diet.

Hvis beskrivelsen over passer deg, din husholdning eller noen du kjenner, ta gjerne kontakt med meg på telefon eller e-mail.

Hilsen Øyvind
Student ved Senter for Utvikling og Miljø, UiO
Mail: oyvind.sundet@sum.uio.no
Tlf: 45 22 86 98
APPENDIX 4: Consent form

Informasjonsskjema om forskningsprosjektet;
*Reduksjon av kjøttforbruk hos norske forbrukere; erfaringer, strategier og utfordringer*

Dette informasjonsskjemaet sendes/gis ut til deltakere i forskningsprosjektet; ‘*Reduksjon av kjøttforbruk hos norske forbrukere; erfaringer, strategier og utfordringer*’
I dette skriftet gir jeg deg informasjon om prosjektet og hva det vil innebære for deg å delta.

**Hvem vil gjennomføre prosjektet?**

**Hva er formålet med prosjektet?**
Dette prosjektet vil først og fremst utgjøre forskerens masteroppgave. Formålet med prosjektet er å bedre forstå hvilke utfordringer folk møter når de prøver å redusere sitt eget kjøttforbruk, både innenfor og utenfor hjemmet; hvordan de går frem for å redusere forbruket, erfaringer de gjør seg og hvilke utfordringer de møter. Datainnsamling og analysen vil fokusere på hvordan forbrukere ‘utøver kjøttreduksjon’ på tvers av forskjellige ‘mat-praksiser’, eksempelvis; handling av mat, matlaging, lunsj på jobb eller grilling.

Utover dette vil innsamlet data muligens anvendes i et større forskningsprosjekt ved navn *MEATigation* - som forsker på hvordan Norges kjøttforbruk skal bli mer bærekraftig.

Du kan lese mer om prosjektet her: [https://www.ntnu.no/nyheter/hvordan-kan-norges-kjottforbruk-bli-mer-baerekraftig/](https://www.ntnu.no/nyheter/hvordan-kan-norges-kjottforbruk-bli-mer-baerekraftig/)

**Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta i studien?**
Du får spørsmål om å delta i undersøkelsen fordi du/din husholdning har utrykket et ønske om å redusere ditt/deres kjøttforbruk.

**Hva vil det innebære å delta i studien?**

intervjuet og hvert enkelt individ vil fylle inn en personlig dagbok. Barn eller ungdom under 18 vil ikke bli inviteret til å delta i studien.

**Det er frivillig å delta**

**Ditt personvern – hvordan brukes og oppbevares dine opplysninger?**

Jeg vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene jeg har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Jeg behandler opplysningene konfidentielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

- Som nevnt over vil lydklipp og elektroniske dagbøker bli lagret på lokale servere og eventuelle skriftlige kopier av dagbøker vil bli låst inne, ved den behandlingsansvarliges institusjon. For å ytterligere sikre at ingen uvedkommende får tilgang til dine personopplysningene vil ditt navn og kontaktopplysningene erstattes med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data.
- Fra behandlingsansvarlig institusjon er det fortrinnsvis forskeren som vil a tilgang til dine opplysninger. Veileder Arve Hansen ved samme institusjon kan dersom ønskelig få innsyn i opplysningene.

Som nevnt tidligere er det en mulighet for at forsyningsprosjektet MEATigation vil få tilgang til dine opplysninger. Tilgang gjelder i så fall følgende forskergruppe;

- **Dr. Arve Hansen**, Postdoktor ved Senter for Utvikling og Miljø, UiO, og ansvarlig for forskergruppens bidrag i prosjektet.
- **Dr. Ulrikke Bryn Wethal**, Postdoktor ved Senter for Utvikling og Miljø, UiO.
- **Dr. Marius Korsnes**, Postdoktor ved det humanistiske fakultet, Norges Tekniske Naturvitenskapelige Universitet (NTNU)

Forskergruppen vil kunne få tilgang til

- Dagbok, i elektronisk eller fysisk format
- Tilgang til transkriberte intervjuer
- Tilgang til lyd-opptak fra intervjuet.

**Husholdning og opplysninger om tredjeperson**
Hvis du er en del av en husholdning vil jeg kort kartlegge denne; hvilke relasjon du har til de du bor med, deres kjønn, alder og beskjæftigelse. Navn eller sensitive opplysninger vil ikke bli registrert. Gitt disse forutsetningene, vil personvernulempen for tredjepersonene være lav. Videre vurderes prosjektet slik at personvernulempen oppveies av samfunnsnytten av prosjektet (vitenskapelig forskning). Det vil derfor ikke være nødvendig å hente inn samtykke fra tredjepersoner, etter personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav e.
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