


The Nutrition Society Winter Meeting was held at the Royal Society of Medicine, London on 4–5 December 2018

## Conference on ‘Optimal diet and lifestyle strategies for the management of cardio-metabolic risk’ International Early Research Championship

### Nudging to get our food choices on a sustainable track

J. Vandenbroele\* , I. Vermeir, M. Geuens, H. Slabbinck and A. Van Kerckhove  
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Department of Marketing, Innovation and Organisation,  
Tweeackerkenstraat 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

Food production is one of the major contributors to environmental damage. Adaptations in our food choices are needed to preserve resources for the needs of future generations. More sustainable consumption patterns have been encouraged by economic incentives, laws, education and communication campaigns. Nonetheless, consumers still find difficulties in trying to change their current food habits. This review takes a behavioural approach in encouraging sustainable food choices among consumers. From a nudging perspective, many behavioural changes can be encouraged in a non-obtrusive way by adapting the complex food environment in which consumers are operating. These interventions do not restrict consumers' choices but rather adapt the choice architecture wherein food decisions are made. Drawing on the literature from diverse theoretical perspectives, we provide an overview of the application of nudging for more sustainable food choices and highlight where more research is needed. More specifically, we discuss research that used nudging to engender cognitive impact (i.e. the use of labels or visibility enhancements), affective responses (i.e. sensorial and social influence cues) and behavioural effects (i.e. adjustments in convenience and product size). We conclude that this review only shows the tip of the iceberg of the research on nudging and sustainable consumption that is likely forthcoming in the next few years, following the successes of nudging applications in other domains. Nonetheless, each individual nudging intervention requires careful examination. Personal predispositions towards the environment should be considered when designing interventions, demonstrating the complementarity of nudging with education on sustainable consumption.

#### Food choices: Nudging: Sustainable consumption

Our current food production has a tremendous effect on the environment. The livestock sector accounts for 14.5 % of human-induced greenhouse gas emissions<sup>(1)</sup>, while the impact of global food consumption in 2010 was estimated at 1.5 metric tons total greenhouse gas emission per capita<sup>(2)</sup>.

Moreover, the agricultural intensification needed to meet our food demand is one of the major contributors to biodiversity loss<sup>(3)</sup>. At the level of household consumption, food contributes 48–70 % of the impact on water and land resources, with meat, dairy and processed foods as the main drivers<sup>(4)</sup>. As our global population is

still growing (9.6 billion by 2050)<sup>(1)</sup>, the future impact of food production on the environment will only become more intense<sup>(5)</sup>.

Food producers are held responsible for climate damage by the public opinion, although consumers are increasingly acknowledging the responsibility of food providers as well<sup>(6,7)</sup>. Retailers, cafeterias, canteens and restaurants all play an important role in shaping our food choices, as they decide on what food will be available to the consumer<sup>(8,9)</sup>. Nonetheless, the role of customers should not be underestimated, as small changes in the individual dietary pattern can collectively significantly decrease

\*Corresponding author: J. Vandenbroele, email [Jolien.Vandenbroele@UGent.be](mailto:Jolien.Vandenbroele@UGent.be)

environmental damage<sup>(10)</sup>. After all, changes in consumer food choice habits dictate changes in food supply<sup>(2)</sup>.

### Sustainable food choices

Sustainable consumption has been defined in the Oslo Roundtable of 1994<sup>(11)</sup> as 'The use of goods and services that respond to basic needs and bring a better quality of life, while minimizing the use of natural resources, toxic materials and emissions of waste and pollutants over the life cycle, so as not to jeopardize the needs of future generations'. As food is an important factor in our consumption pattern, it is not surprising that the 2015 European Nutrition Conference was hosted with a special symposium on 'sustainable consumption'<sup>(12)</sup>. Nonetheless, an in-depth discussion of what can be labelled as 'sustainable food' is out of the scope of the present paper and will mainly be illustrated by the foods that are targeted in the studies of our review. That is, many researchers focus on how to effectively promote products that contribute less to CO<sub>2</sub>-emissions (e.g. plant-based food such as vegetarian products, vegetables and fruit), while also investigating how consumers can be motivated to reduce their consumption of products with high CO<sub>2</sub>-emissions (e.g. red meat<sup>(13,14)</sup>). Besides, the promotion of products that are locally produced has also been heavily studied because these products avoid environmental damage from transportation<sup>(15)</sup>. Nonetheless, transportation accounts for only 11 % of the greenhouse gas emissions in the food cycle, and production is still the main source, accounting for 83 % in the USA<sup>(16)</sup>.

### Nudging

This review focuses on interventions that aim to promote sustainable food choices and discourage less sustainable options. More specifically, we provide an overview of the results obtained by means of nudging. Nudging aims to change people's behaviour in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives<sup>(17)</sup>. Hence, nudging differs from initiatives that aim to make sustainable consumption more economically appealing, for instance subsidies for solar panels. Moreover, nudging initiatives tend to be relatively less costly than educational initiatives<sup>(18)</sup>. Nudging also does not impose any restrictions as do enforced laws, such as the banning of plastic, but embraces the freedom of choice for the customer<sup>(19)</sup>. This principle of libertarian paternalism is one of the two core principles of nudging<sup>(20)</sup>.

Indeed, nudging interventions are rather unobtrusive and trigger consumer responses without requiring much cognitive effort<sup>(17)</sup>. This difference in cognitive effort is also exactly what differentiates nudging from classic informational campaigns and education, which aim to convince consumers to change their attitudes with rational arguments<sup>(21)</sup>; a process that requires more cognitive effort<sup>(22)</sup>. This approach might not be suitable in a food context, where a choice between options is often guided by fast, automatic and/or cognitively effortless responses to environmental stimuli. A thoughtful, slow

and/or analytical processing of all available food options would be too time-consuming in many conditions, such as in making food decisions<sup>(23)</sup>.

Indeed, many so-called dual process theories distinguish between two processing styles<sup>(24)</sup>, of which Kahneman's System 1 (fast and effortless processing) and System 2 (slower and analytical processing) are the most prominent<sup>(25)</sup>. Even if communication campaigns succeed, such that sustainable information is processed under high cognitive effort and positive attitudes have been created, behavioural changes are still not guaranteed. The attitude-behaviour gap for sustainable behaviour illustrates that consumers often have positive predispositions towards sustainable consumption, but these do not always translate into actual behavioural changes<sup>(26)</sup>.

For this reason, nudging starts from the perspective of the consumer. Knowing how consumers make food decisions in a complex food environment provides insight into how food presentation may lead to sustainable food purchase choices by the consumer. This is called an optimisation of the choice architecture, which establishes the second core principle of nudging<sup>(20)</sup>. Many elements in a food environment will affect our choices, such as the way products are positioned<sup>(27)</sup>, their visibility<sup>(28)</sup> or packaging<sup>(29)</sup>. The results of these types of interventions at the point of purchase, such as in retail stores, cafeterias and restaurants, seem promising<sup>(30,31)</sup>, and consumers also believe that these interventions can help them more easily regulate their in-store consumption decisions<sup>(32)</sup>.

Our review provides a non-exhaustive overview of the application of nudging for more sustainable food choices at the point of purchase. For some categories of nudging, research on sustainable food choices is still in its infancy, so we enriched our discussion with insights from general sustainable consumption, health research, policy making and consumer behaviour. In doing so, we also highlighted the domains where more research is needed. To the best of our knowledge, no framework on sustainable food choices has yet been published. Therefore, we built our review on the framework for the in-field health interventions of Cadario and Chandon<sup>(33)</sup>. They categorised the nudges according to whether the nudge exerted an influence on consumers' cognition (i.e. consumer knowledge), effect (i.e. consumers' feelings) or behaviour (i.e. motor responses).

### Cognitively oriented interventions

#### *Descriptive labelling*

Consumers' interest for specific product attributes, such as origin, ingredients and production process, has gradually increased over the years<sup>(34)</sup>. Consequently, labels focusing on food attributes have become increasingly popular, as demonstrated by the many studies on energy and nutrition labelling (see Cowburn and Stockley<sup>(35)</sup> for a systematic review). A similar trend can be detected for sustainable products, such that many products display sustainable labels on food packaging, menus in restaurants or next to the product in buffets<sup>(34)</sup>. The complexity of what can be considered sustainable consumption also implies that



a wide variety of sustainable labels can be used<sup>(36)</sup>, ranging from where the product is coming from (i.e. 'local'<sup>(37,38)</sup>), to how it is produced (i.e. 'organic', 'fair trade', 'recycled'<sup>(39,40)</sup>) or which non-sustainable ingredients are removed from the product (i.e. 'free from'<sup>(41)</sup>).

Sustainable labels might function as eye-catchers when consumers are shopping in an environment where many products are competing for attention and cognitive resources are limited<sup>(42)</sup>. Labels can also help consumers determine whether a product is sustainable<sup>(43,44)</sup>. For example, labels can give information on the seasonality of products<sup>(37,45)</sup>, and whether the product is certified by a third party according to specific sustainability criteria (cf. Rainforest Alliance certificate<sup>(46)</sup>) or human respect criteria (cf. Fair Trade certificate<sup>(47)</sup>). Recent research also shows the positive effects of sustainable labels on product perceptions; eco-labels have positively affected taste judgements and willingness to pay<sup>(48)</sup>, wine labelled as organic has led to higher taste ratings<sup>(49)</sup>, and products that are defined as 'local' have become more popular because of higher taste and quality associations<sup>(37)</sup>.

However, descriptive labels not only impact consumers' attention, information and associations with sustainable products but also have been shown to evoke emotional and behavioural responses. Products labelled as organic are believed to contribute to environmental protection (i.e. appealing to utilitarian attitudes), and as such, people experience emotional gratification from buying organic (i.e. appealing to hedonic attitudes<sup>(50)</sup>). Even before buying, feelings of anticipated pride can predict pro-environmental choices later on<sup>(51)</sup>. Nonetheless, a more negative feeling (i.e. guilt) has been demonstrated to make people feel more personally responsible for environmental damage and increase the likelihood that people buy products with sustainable labels<sup>(52)</sup> or support pro-environmental behaviour<sup>(53,54)</sup>. Eco-labels that focus on omitting non-sustainable ingredients, such as 'free from palm oil', affect behavioural intentions such as the 'willingness to pay a price premium' among people who actively look for information and have a high preference for naturalness<sup>(41)</sup>.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the effects of sustainable labels on consumer response; however, the direction of the effects is ambiguous and largely determined by personality traits such as environmental concern<sup>(39,48,55–58)</sup>. For example, whether consumers notice sustainable labels has been shown to depend largely on their implicit (i.e. neurophysiological emotional reactions) and explicit (i.e. self-reported feelings) positive predispositions towards sustainable behaviour<sup>(40,59)</sup>. Moreover, the positive effects of sustainability claims are more profoundly observed when consumers understand and trust the labels<sup>(26,60–62)</sup>. Organic labels may also backfire, such that consumers who are less concerned with the environment perceive organic labelled products as less tasty<sup>(63,64)</sup>. Buying organic labelled products might also trigger compensation behaviour (i.e. additional purchases of less sustainable products), so that consumers end up with a higher total environmental impact of their food purchases<sup>(65)</sup>. Moreover, the wide

variety and multiple application of sustainable logos<sup>(66)</sup> can be confusing for consumers<sup>(67)</sup>, so that they might follow the heuristic that a labelled product is better than one without label, instead of actually deciphering the provided information on the sustainability label of the product<sup>(41,60)</sup>. To better align labels with consumers' preferences, more research is needed on the level at which labels should be created (e.g. Belgian v. European<sup>(68)</sup>) and on which measures they should be based (e.g. food miles v. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions<sup>(68)</sup>). Lastly, few studies have investigated how sustainable labels affect actual food choices; a 2013 study<sup>(69)</sup> even found that sustainable logos did not affect the food choices of European consumers at the time.

### *Evaluative labelling*

As consumers face a hard time deciphering different sustainable attributes, it is suggested to ease their understanding by providing evaluative information rather than descriptive information<sup>(70)</sup>. Evaluative labels of sustainability can use ratings that provide an immediate indication of how sustainable the product is, such that food labels carry low–medium–high descriptions or a one-, two- or three-star rating<sup>(71,72)</sup>. A field study on healthiness showed that significantly fewer 'high-fat' and 'high-energy' products were sold when labelled as such, while the sales of 'low-fat' and 'low-energy' products went up<sup>(73)</sup>. One study on sustainable evaluative labelling<sup>(74)</sup> also highlights the importance of healthiness perceptions. They found that a high sustainability label increases product preference only if the food product is perceived as being high in healthiness. Hence, a fit between the level of sustainability and healthiness was needed for the 'high' sustainable label to be successful, perhaps because the average consumer expects sustainable products to be more healthy, as demonstrated in another study<sup>(55)</sup>. In a similar vein, ample research efforts have recently been put into creating labels that combine the impact of food on healthiness and sustainability<sup>(75,76)</sup>. These labels provide an overall dietary quality score, although the approach on how to quantify this measure is not yet unified among researchers.

Colour coding can be another way to support consumers in making better decisions<sup>(77)</sup>. For example, traffic light labelling builds on our socially learned associations that the colour green signals safety, while red signals danger, which leads to the assumption that red can function as a consumption-stopping cue<sup>(78)</sup>. Applying this idea to evaluative labelling, more sustainable products would be marked with a green label, while less sustainable products would be marked with a red label<sup>(79,80)</sup>. Research showed that health decisions were improved by applying traffic light labelling in a cafeteria or university canteen<sup>(79–81)</sup>, although an online experiment found mixed results depending on the country of origin (positive effect in Germany v. no significant difference in Poland)<sup>(82)</sup>. In a grocery setting, the sales of black labelled products (i.e. high carbon emission) decreased by 6%, while the sales of green labelled products (i.e. low carbon emission) increased by 4%<sup>(77)</sup>. Interestingly, the intention to

avoid red labels is greater than the preference for green labels<sup>(72,83)</sup>. This might be explained by consumers' perception that negative information (i.e. red logo) looms larger<sup>(84)</sup> than positive information. However, the effectiveness of colour labelling does not generalise across products; the negative effect of a red surface on food selection appears to be more profoundly observed for unhealthy (*v.* healthy) products<sup>(85)</sup>. This highlights the importance of a fit between consumers' perceptions on what is 'bad' and the colour (e.g. unhealthy food and red) and that the effects are less clear when there is a mismatch (e.g. healthy food and red). This raises the question of whether colour coding would work for sustainable food choices, for which consumers' associations on what is 'bad' and 'good' might be less strong.

Note that not all studies find positive effects in evaluative labelling on food choices<sup>(82,86)</sup>, and some authors warn of compensatory consumption<sup>(87)</sup>. Consumers might compensate for 'low' label purchases with less sustainable choices in side dishes or in their following food choices. Moreover, they may be exclusively focused on the characteristic that is 'low', so they overlook other negative characteristics of the food product (e.g. low-fat and high-sugar food<sup>(88)</sup>). Future research should determine whether evaluative labelling on sustainable products also triggers such compensatory effects.

#### *Visibility enhancements*

Visual attention (i.e. the amount of fixation time) is an important proxy for product selection<sup>(89)</sup>; therefore, the positioning of sustainable products at the point of purchase should be carefully considered. For example, products that are presented at eye level<sup>(90,91)</sup> have been shown to draw more attention and enter more easily the set of products considered by the consumer<sup>(92)</sup>. Another attention hotspot in retail stores is the shelf next to the cash register, where consumers have time to process the offerings while queuing to pay<sup>(93)</sup>. Even the order of products on a restaurant menu can impact food choices, such that products placed at the top of the menu benefit from a primacy effect and tend to be selected more often<sup>(94,95)</sup>. A recent study<sup>(96)</sup> applied two visibility interventions on sustainable products for 9 months in a university canteen by changing the menu order (i.e. from the middle to the top position) and increasing the visibility of vegetarian products (i.e. more visible location). Combining both interventions increased the sales share of the vegetarian dishes significantly compared to all purchases with six percentage points. Moreover, a significant long-term effect was observed, so that after the intervention period, the share of vegetarian dishes was still four percentage points higher compared to the baseline period.

Increasing the availability of sustainable products in the assortment is also often related to greater visibility, and together, they have a strong effect on purchase intentions<sup>(28)</sup>. Although the assortment of more sustainable food choices, such as organic and vegetarian products, has been increasing over the years, its share is still relatively small compared to general products<sup>(97,98)</sup>. Studies

on healthier food choices show promising results in that increasing the relative share of healthier foods (e.g. from 25 to 75 %) translates into more healthy purchases: the chances of buying a healthy product were multiplied by 2.9 times in an online study and 3.5 times in a canteen<sup>(99)</sup>. Interestingly, regarding the principles of nudging<sup>(17)</sup>, consumers did not perceive the assortment to be more restrictive by the intervention. Another field experiment combines healthy labelling and increased availability so that students chose more healthy options in the vending machine<sup>(72)</sup>. One study found mixed results: increasing the share of healthy options encouraged the sales of healthy dishes in only two out of six cafeterias<sup>(100)</sup>.

Incorporating sustainable products in the existing assortment can be challenging for managers<sup>(101)</sup>, as they can choose to mix them with the existing assortment (i.e. comparative positioning) or offer them separately (i.e. unique feature positioning). For example, meat substitutes, which are vegetarian products that are sensory similar to a specific meat product, are currently mostly shelved in a unique feature positioning<sup>(102)</sup>. However, this separate shelf might be consistently skipped by non-vegetarians, so that meat substitutes do not enter the consideration set of these consumers. Non-users could be helped in recognizing meat substitutes as valuable alternatives by placing them next to the mimicked meat product<sup>(103)</sup>. Suggestions are made that in this choice architecture, meat substitutes might appear as more familiar and less novel, as their sensory similarity with the mimicked product can be easily observed<sup>(104–106)</sup>.

This positioning question also pertains to when evaluative labels are used (e.g. one-, two- or three-star sustainability rating) and raises the question of where the 'mildly' sustainable products should be offered. Research suggests<sup>(107)</sup> that when there is a fit between the price setting and the product (i.e. intermediate price and intermediate star rating), sales increase if these products are positioned in a separate section. However, if there is no match and the two-star product is offered at a low price, mixing them with the low and high ratings (i.e. comparative positioning) has been found to boost the sales of the intermediate product. Positioning is also a critical challenge in online food retail, as the categorisation of the products highly affects purchases<sup>(108)</sup>. Moreover, environmental attitudes should again be considered when optimizing shelf management. That is, if the assortment is aligned with the consumers' goal, so that organic products are presented separately and the consumer has the intention to buy an organic product, organic purchases have been found to be higher compared to when they are comparatively positioned with other products that are not related to consumers' goal<sup>(107)</sup>.

#### **Affectively oriented interventions**

##### *Hedonic enhancements*

Hedonic interventions trigger our senses so that products become more attractive by appealing to our taste, vision,

olfaction (i.e. smell), audition and haptics (i.e. touch). Research on sensory marketing has gained importance over the past few years<sup>(109)</sup>. Therefore, we will extend the original category in the framework of Cadario and Chandon<sup>(33)</sup> on hedonic enhancements by discussing research on each sense. We categorise on the main sensory characteristic of the nudge, although some nudges might trigger other senses and processes too, so the categorisation is not mutually exclusive.

**Vision.** Visual packaging elements play an important role in shaping expectations about products and their sensory properties, and some might even affect taste perceptions<sup>(58)</sup>. A recent study shows that the sales of vegetarian products can be boosted by giving them a more attractive description, such as 'fresh seasonal risotto primavera', instead of 'risotto primavera'<sup>(110)</sup>, although this effect was negatively related to the frequency of eating vegetarian foods. Other studies focus more on 'fun' descriptions; however, 'wacky wundermelon slushies' were not more frequently bought than general melons, even in combination with a taste-testing<sup>(111)</sup>. In contrast, indulgent descriptions such as 'slow-roasted caramelised zucchini bites' increased both the food choice and portion serving in a university cafeteria<sup>(112)</sup>. More research is thus needed to determine which types of descriptions work to encourage sustainable choices.

Other visual elements are non-descriptive; the use of curvature figures on packaging, such as circles, has been shown to increase the consumers' sensitivity for sweetness and hedonic ratings<sup>(113)</sup>. Warm and saturated (v. less vibrantly coloured) packages are perceived as more attractive for healthy food packages because these colours are closer to the ones of general products and thus might reduce the lower hedonic associations with healthy foods<sup>(29)</sup>. This might also be an appealing strategy to promote sustainable products for consumers who are less concerned with the environment, as they perceive organic products as less tasty<sup>(63)</sup>. Food in sustainable packaging is also perceived as having better quality compared to non-sustainable packaging because of the fit between sustainable food and a higher perceived naturalness<sup>(114)</sup>.

The way in which food is presented can also be an important predictor of food preference. Monochrome (v. coloured) pictures of food on menus have been demonstrated to be preferred and evoke a higher willingness to try the foods, and even the presentation of the food (i.e. balance) moderates this effect, such that pictures with colours and a balanced food presentation are rated as more attractive<sup>(115)</sup>. Moreover, some research reports on the consumer belief that healthier products are less tasty<sup>(116)</sup>, although some recent findings demonstrate that this belief is not shared by everyone<sup>(117,118)</sup>. Hence, mimicking junk food characteristics (i.e. association with better taste) on healthy foods can help mitigate these associations. For example, seasonal fruit and vegetables presented in the format of a burger in advertising might be appreciated more because of the inferred taste associations to the junk food<sup>(119)</sup>. Implying motion in the way food is presented in advertising enhances freshness perceptions and evaluations of the

food, which is theorised to be a consequence of an evolutionary learned sensitivity to motion<sup>(120)</sup>. Another cue that enhances product freshness perceptions and appeal is a glossy package<sup>(121)</sup>, which is suggested to be a result of our innate need for water<sup>(122)</sup>.

Some visual nudges are more related to the atmosphere of the store (see Spence *et al.*<sup>(123)</sup> for a review). It is suggested that store traffic could be enhanced by putting effort into creative store windows<sup>(124)</sup>. Moreover, hanging nature posters above vending machines has been found to evoke healthiness feelings and increase the sales of healthy options<sup>(125)</sup>. As consumers appear to link sustainability with healthiness<sup>(74)</sup>, future research could examine whether this intervention would also enhance the sales of sustainable food products. In-store, brighter (v. softer) lighting increased the attention time and chances of picking up the product, although it did not increase the sales of the target product<sup>(126)</sup>. Another field experiment<sup>(127)</sup> did not find any influence of light interventions in-store; it is thus questionable whether lightning could stimulate sustainable product sales.

**Taste.** The sampling of food can be a strong nudge in itself and is a frequently applied intervention in-store<sup>(123)</sup>. Food sampling has positive effects on perceptions of food quality, consumer trial and long-term food sales<sup>(128,129)</sup>. Tastings can be especially useful for increasing the familiarity of novel sustainable products, such as tofu and soya milk, particularly among food neophobic people who have a less positive attitude towards novel foods<sup>(111,130)</sup>. Food choice can also be led by taste beliefs. A well-known example of taste beliefs is the place-of-origin cue, such as the strong association between pasta and Italy. The narrower the geographic origin (Italy v. Tuscany) is, the higher the quality associations and willingness to pay for a specialty food<sup>(131)</sup>. This is an interesting finding for sustainable foods that are produced locally<sup>(132)</sup>. Moreover, this positive cue also influences sampling experiences, such that a positive region-of-origin association has shown a greater effect on taste assessments when this information is provided before (v. after) the sampling<sup>(133,134)</sup>.

**Audition.** Music at the point-of-purchase generally has a positive impact on consumer behaviour<sup>(135,136)</sup>, although its effect also depends heavily on contextual factors<sup>(136)</sup>. For example, the fit between the environment and the music plays a crucial role, such that French wine has been shown to sell more when French music is played<sup>(137)</sup>. Ambient music also affects cognitive perceptions; classical music has been associated with a higher expected service<sup>(131,138)</sup> and leads to more spending<sup>(139)</sup>. Not only purchase-related behaviour can be influenced by music, but also the speed of in-store traffic; a slower tempo in music has been found to literally slow down customers<sup>(136)</sup> and increase sales<sup>(140)</sup>. One recent study<sup>(141)</sup> examined the relationship between nature sounds and the willingness to purchase sustainable products in a field experiment. The results showed a medium size effect for male customers that initially had a lower purchase intention for organic foods.

**Haptics.** Lush, a soap store with a focus on sustainability, approaches entering customers by asking

if they want to try their products<sup>(123)</sup>. Why has this been proven to be a valuable marketing strategy and are we so keen on touching products? Much of our likeability for touch is related to our personal 'need for touch'<sup>(142)</sup>, and consumers with a higher need for touch feel more confident about their product judgement after touch (*v.* not<sup>(143)</sup>). In general, touching a product leads to increased feelings of ownership<sup>(144)</sup>, which makes us value the product more highly (*i.e.* endowment effect). Considering our innate loss aversion towards products we own, higher ownership feelings after touching sustainable products can nudge consumers into buying them<sup>(145)</sup>. However, touch can also evoke feelings of 'disgust', so that it is demonstrated that consumers like products less when they are touched by others (*i.e.* consumer contamination<sup>(146)</sup>). The appeal of sustainable food also decreases if they are 'touching' (*i.e.* physically next to each other on the shelf) moderately disgusting products, such as trash bags and cat litter (*i.e.* product contagion<sup>(147)</sup>).

The importance of touch in our daily life also poses a challenge for marketers considering the novel ways in which we are buying foods. Online grocery shopping does not involve any haptics, so purchases might be different from those in a regular brick-and-mortar store. Sales data show that consumers make more healthy purchases in online compared to offline channels<sup>(148)</sup>. In an additional laboratory study, the authors explain this finding by demonstrating that consumers are more tempted to purchase unhealthy items offline because of higher product vividness, while online, products are only symbolically presented. Even the way in which we buy online affects purchases, such that 'direct touch' via an iPad has been shown to lead to more healthier (*v.* healthier) choices than 'indirect touch' via the mouse of a desktop computer<sup>(149)</sup>. Research is needed to determine whether sustainable sales would also be greater in purchase channels involving less touch, and if sustainable products lose to less sustainable products if both can be touched.

**Olfaction.** In general, although we have some difficulties with naming scents, people are masters in distinguishing different odours<sup>(150)</sup>. Smell is the only sense that is related directly to our memory, such that the use of odours and olfactory information in marketing has been a frequently researched topic<sup>(109)</sup>. For example, the recall of brand attributes has shown to be higher if the product was scented *v.* not, and this effect was stronger for a product scent compared to an ambient scent (*i.e.* scents in the environment<sup>(151)</sup>). The authors believe that this latter finding can be explained because product scent focuses on the scent-related associations of only one product (*v.* multiple products). Nonetheless, in general, research shows a positive effect of ambient scents on store evaluations, such that some stores even sprinkle a signature scent<sup>(152,153)</sup>. Ambient scents can evoke emotions that lead to enhanced product evaluations as long as there is a fit between the scent and the product<sup>(154)</sup>. However, the effect of scent on actual food choice is less clear. Bread and cucumber odours improved mood among participants, but no

effect was found on their subsequent lunch choice<sup>(155)</sup>. Another study<sup>(156)</sup> also found contradictory results, such that bread was not the preferred option in the bread aroma condition (*i.e.* congruency between aroma and choice) but in a non-congruent aroma condition. Although research shows some tentative results for using scents to enhance the in-store experience of sustainable stores, further research is needed to determine whether scents can influence actual product choices.

### *Social influences*

In addition to changing the food choice architecture, people can also be nudged by other consumers' behaviour<sup>(157)</sup>. Because social desirability plays an important role in sustainable behaviour<sup>(158)</sup>, we will extend the discussion of Cadario and Chandon<sup>(33)</sup> on 'healthy eating calls' by incorporating insights into different types of social influences. First, the use of social norms is a frequently applied intervention to nudge consumers towards a desired behaviour; it accompanies rules and standards that are shared by the members of the same community<sup>(159)</sup>. Social norms can be either descriptive or injunctive, such that descriptive norms describe the behaviour of people (*e.g.* the average household energy consumption), while injunctive norms also evaluate this information in terms of consumers' approval (*e.g.* adding a happy or sad smiley to indicate whether people are under or above the average energy consumption<sup>(160)</sup>). Authors warn that descriptive norms can backfire, for example, when people score better than the provided norm (and consequently increase their energy consumption<sup>(160)</sup>) or when the message implies that it is acceptable to perform harmful behaviour because many people are doing so (*e.g.* the majority of the people throw cigarette butts on the street<sup>(161)</sup>).

Nonetheless, these counterproductive effects can be eliminated by adding an injunctive norm to descriptive information (*e.g.* sad/happy smiley<sup>(160)</sup>). Anthropomorphic cues, attributing human characteristics (*e.g.* sad faces) to non-human products, have been demonstrated to evoke feelings of sympathy towards the messenger that appear to reinforce normative behaviour, so that it eventually leads to increased sustainable behaviour to favour the messenger, but only when this behaviour does not come at an extra cost<sup>(162)</sup>. Similarly, anthropomorphism can be applied to advertise wonky foods (*i.e.* misshapen produce). Although generally perceived as less tasty, higher purchase intentions when wonky foods are anthropomorphised show the potential of anthropomorphism as an intervention for battling food waste<sup>(163)</sup>. Other symbols, such as the use of predetermined compartments on lunch trays for vegetables and fruit, can also evoke a social norm to increase the intake of targeted products.

Another recommendation is to frame the descriptive message in a positive way (*e.g.* the majority of the people throw cigarette butts in the bin<sup>(164)</sup>). A recent study<sup>(158)</sup> shows the effectiveness of using positive descriptive norms if consumers perceive the message as credible,



even when the promoted behaviour is not sustainable (i.e. avoid overpackaging) and not yet adopted by the majority of the people. Conversely, descriptive (but not injunctive) norms are better for promoting behaviour than preventing it<sup>(165)</sup>. The persuasiveness of the message might also play a role, such that a field experiment shows that stronger (*v.* weaker) norms are more effective in enhancing eco-labelled purchases<sup>(166)</sup>. However, some studies found no effects of positive descriptive messages<sup>(167,168)</sup>. Overall, social norms and feedback seem to be promising nudges<sup>(169)</sup>, as also identified by a meta-analysis that classifies these interventions as having one of the greater effect sizes among interventions in promoting sustainable behaviour<sup>(170)</sup>.

Another promising intervention indicated by this meta-analysis<sup>(170)</sup> is verbal prompting. A recent field study<sup>(171)</sup> applied a diverse set of verbal prompts, such as questioning whether customers would buy non-environmental or environmentally friendly bananas (*cf.* question-behaviour effect<sup>(172)</sup>), and approaching customers with the assumption that they seem interested in buying eco-labelled products. All verbal prompts increased sustainable choices compared with the baseline sales. In a self-service restaurant, more healthy side dishes were bought when customers were verbally prompted, while customers indicated feeling no buying pressure<sup>(173)</sup>. Signalling towards other people appears to be very important; sustainable purchases can be increased by verbal prompting in the presence of other store-employees<sup>(171)</sup>. Indeed, pro-environmental behaviour shows some links with status signalling<sup>(174)</sup>, such that a status motive has been demonstrated to lead to more sustainable purchases<sup>(157,174)</sup>. In fact, some evidence<sup>(175)</sup> shows that the signal works in that vegetarian and meat alternative (e.g. insect-based burger) eaters are perceived as being more environmentally friendly and even more brave and interesting compared to meat eaters.

When eating in a social environment, people are also affected by the food choice and intake of others and adapt these according to the group, as demonstrated in a meta-analysis<sup>(176)</sup>. Field data from a restaurant show that people tend to seek variety in their individual dishes but not in the menu category<sup>(177)</sup>. This is an interesting finding to nudge sustainable food choices; perhaps if someone orders vegetarian food, the others might follow with dishes within the vegetarian food category. Promoting vegetarian foods by framing them as the 'recommendation of the chef' is also a way to prompt vegetarian food choices among infrequent eaters of vegetarian food<sup>(110)</sup>.

Social influences even go beyond written and verbal interactions with people. For example, consumers attach some social beliefs to the positioning of products in-store, such that products in-between two products of the same category are believed to be more popular because of the middle position, which functions as a positive cue leading to higher purchases<sup>(178,179)</sup>. If consumers do not have strong preferences for products, the scarcity of products on shelves might also function as a popularity cue that affects consumer choices<sup>(180)</sup>. Lastly, in view of the many ways in which social influences affect sustainable

purchases, note that social desirability biases in the survey and experimental research on sustainability should always be taken into account<sup>(158)</sup>.

## Behaviourally oriented interventions

### *Convenience enhancements*

To make sustainable food choices more attractive, they should be convenient and easy to access, while the required effort for buying less sustainable products is preferably larger. Studies on choice architecture show that accessibility enhancements, for example, placing fruit and vegetables at the beginning of the buffet increase the self-serving portions of these target products<sup>(181)</sup>. Moreover, the increase in fruit and vegetables was not compensated for by other meal components; the increase substituted servings of other meal components. Another study in a cafeteria setting<sup>(182)</sup> changed the order of foods so that energy-dense products were less accessible to favour the sales of low-energy foods. However, no effects were observed by placing wholegrain bread in a more convenient place<sup>(183)</sup>. Placing products on a lower *v.* higher shelf also did not affect the sales of healthier snacks<sup>(99)</sup>. Perhaps, the effectiveness of product accessibility as a nudge depends on the type of product to which the nudge is applied. For example, a field experiment was not able to generate greater sales of unfamiliar vegetables by increasing their accessibility<sup>(184)</sup>.

A concept that is closely related to accessibility is proximity. In a trade-off between healthy (i.e. apples) and non-healthy options (i.e. popcorn) that are manipulated in terms of distance (within-reach *v.* 2 m away), researchers found higher consumption of the food that is positioned closer<sup>(185)</sup>. Putting a bowl of M&Ms at 20, 70 and 140 cm decreased intake with increasing distance<sup>(186)</sup>. At work, it is shown that fewer snacks are purchased if the vending machine is placed further from the office desks<sup>(187)</sup>. Even small required efforts, such as when potato chips are located in a distant snack bar *v.* at the cash register, have been found to discourage unhealthy choices<sup>(188)</sup>. Notably, no main effects were found on the proximity (20 *v.* 70 cm) or snack type when simultaneously presenting a bowl of chocolates and fruit<sup>(189)</sup>. Rather, a relative proximity effect was observed, such that higher consumption of fruit was only obtained when the chocolate bowl was placed further (*v.* closer).

A typically employed and effective nudging strategy is to present the consumer with a 'default option', in which consumers are presented with a pre-determined item as a first or more prominent choice, thus requiring less effortful analytical decision making on the part of the consumer<sup>(190)</sup>. Defaults can also be used in food research; research shows that parents select healthier breakfast options for their children when they are readily available (*v.* only available on request)<sup>(191)</sup>. Another study shows that healthier whole wheat (*v.* white) bread was more often selected when it was the default option for ordering a sandwich<sup>(192)</sup>. Further evidence can be found in a

restaurant setting<sup>(193)</sup>, where healthier choices were ordered more when presented as the default option on the menu. Overall, these studies suggest the potential to increase sustainable food choices by making them the default option. Note that nudging theory does not support choice restriction<sup>(194)</sup>.

Convenience can also be related to the way in which food products are offered. For example, self-servings are found to be lower when customers have to take the food with a pair of tongs *v.* a spoon<sup>(182)</sup>. Other research shows that servings from squeeze tubes (*v.* regular jars) are more easy to monitor by consumers<sup>(195)</sup>, and that people eat less from resealable (*v.* non-resealable) packages because they have to re-open them<sup>(196)</sup>, which might be interesting findings in the case of less healthy content. Findings are less clear on preparing foods so that they are easier to eat; pre-sliced fruit was perceived as less attractive in terms of sensory and packaging characteristics<sup>(197)</sup>. Supermarkets are also increasingly offering bundles of food (e.g. all ingredients for a dish in one box). A recent study shows that this might be a promising nudge to counter the effect that people choose less healthy options when they are cognitively loaded as a result of the mental process of planning and sourcing individual ingredients<sup>(198)</sup>. Food bundles simplify shopping choices so that customers under cognitive load have been found to more frequently choose food bundles, although only if the food bundles are non-discounted (*v.* discounted). Packages of sustainable food products might thus be an appealing nudge in making sustainability more convenient.

#### *Size enhancements*

Portion size interventions might be especially interesting in decreasing the sales volume for products of which its production has a high impact on the environment, such as meat<sup>(199)</sup>. Research has extensively demonstrated that portion sizes and intake are also positively related (i.e. portion size effect<sup>(200,201)</sup>) so that smaller portion sizes also decrease consumption. Verbal prompting by asking customers in a restaurant whether they want to downsize their portion successfully increased the number of smaller portions by one-third, while no compensation behaviour (i.e. higher energetic side dishes or drinks) was observed<sup>(202)</sup>. Another way to encourage smaller portions is offering them next to default larger portion sizes, which significantly nudged customers in a cafeteria to switch from a larger to a smaller portion size<sup>(30)</sup>. A field experiment<sup>(203)</sup> found that adding two smaller portions of meat sausage units next to the default portion size unobtrusively encouraged customers to buy smaller units. During a 1-month intervention period, more than half the units sold (52 %) were smaller portions than the default larger portion size, which established a decrease in meat volume of 13 % if all units sold would have been the default size. Portion sizes can also be adapted to promote sales volume and intake, and increasing the portion sizes of vegetables and fruit led to a greater intake among children<sup>(204)</sup>. Nonetheless, the effects of changes in portion sizes on food choices

and consumption should be carefully examined. Authors warn of the possible backfire effects that (multiple) smaller portions would eventually lead to higher consumption, and that smaller portions (compared to larger ones) are less likely to activate a self-control conflict that leads to careful monitoring of consumption<sup>(205)</sup>.

Portion size judgement is also heavily influenced by our perception. For example, the same portion size has been found to be perceived as being larger when presented horizontal (*v.* vertical) on a plate<sup>(206)</sup>. Moreover, consumers perceive food portions placed centrally on a plate (*v.* slightly offset) as larger. In addition to the way food is presented on a plate, plate size also affects perceptions, so that consumers have been demonstrated to eat more from larger plates<sup>(201)</sup>. Nonetheless, other studies found no effect of plate size on consumption<sup>(207)</sup>, and larger plate sizes might also lead to a greater intake of vegetables<sup>(208)</sup>. Considering consumers' preference for middle options<sup>(178)</sup>, size labels might trigger people to always go for the in-between-option, regardless of its portion size. Moreover, people report to feel less guilty when consuming a larger portion of hedonic food if it is labelled as 'small'<sup>(209)</sup>. Nonetheless, the authors also found that consumers are not 'fooled' by smaller items carrying a 'large' label.

#### **Conclusion**

In 2017, the Nobel Prize for Economics was awarded to Thaler for his work on behavioural economics<sup>(20)</sup>. Inspired by his theory on nudging, which was co-created with Cass. S. Sunstein, many researchers are currently looking at how we can apply nudging principles for societal outcomes, such as improved healthiness and safety of people, and nature preservation. This review aimed to provide a non-exhaustive overview of nudging and sustainable food choices and highlights the different areas where more research is needed. In summary, our review has demonstrated the potential of nudging to be a valuable technique in encouraging environmentally friendly purchases. Nonetheless, not all studies were able to obtain significantly beneficial results from only changing the choice architecture. Personal predispositions towards sustainable consumption cannot be overlooked in designing nudges, demonstrating the complementarity of nudging research with educational interventions. The vast majority of the studies were conducted in Western and highly developed societies. Less is known about the effectiveness of nudges in other cultures. Interventions should also be carefully designed, taking cognitive processes<sup>(210)</sup> and the conditions of the environment into account (see Meder *et al.*<sup>(211)</sup>). Moreover, as many nudging studies have focused on short-term interventions, it is still unclear whether nudging will work in the long term. Nudging and its libertarian paternalism view have also been criticised for its use of defaults<sup>(212)</sup> and other ethical criteria (see Rebonato<sup>(213)</sup> for an overview). We also call for more multidisciplinary research so that behavioural scientists focus their research on the topics that may yield the highest ecological return. It is our hope that





this review can inspire researchers to tackle these challenges and contribute to further research on nudging and sustainability.

### Acknowledgements

None.

### Financial Support

J. V. received grants from the Special Research Fund of Ghent University (BOFDOC2016001601) and the National Bank of Belgium (BOFDOC20160016C1).

### Conflicts of Interest

None.

### Authorship

J. V. drafted the manuscript. I. V., M. G., H. S. and A. K. V. revised the manuscript. All the authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

### References

- Gerber P, Steinfeld H, Henderson B *et al.* (2013) *Tackling Climate Change through Livestock – A Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Girod B, van Vuuren DP & Hertwich EG (2014) Climate policy through changing consumption choices: options and obstacles for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. *Glob Environ Change* **25**, 5–15.
- Hilton-Taylor C (2000) *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. Gland, Switzerland: World Conserv. Union.
- Ivanova D, Stadler K, Steen-Olsen K *et al.* (2016) Environmental impact assessment of household consumption. *J Ind Ecol* **20**, 526–536.
- McMichael AJ, Powles JW, Butler CD *et al.* (2007) Food, livestock production, energy, climate change, and health. *Lancet* **370**, 1253–1263.
- Jones P, Hillier D & Comfort D (2011) Shopping for tomorrow: promoting sustainable consumption within food stores. *Br Food J* **113**, 935–948.
- Peattie K (2010) Green consumption: behavior and norms. *Annu Rev Environ Resour* **35**, 195–228.
- Dawson J (2013) Retailer activity in shaping food choice. *Food Qual Prefer* **28**, 339–347.
- Lehner M (2015) Translating sustainability: the role of the retail store. *Int J Retail Distrib Manage* **43**, 386–402.
- Stehfest E, Bouwman L, van Vuren D *et al.* (2009) Climate benefits of changing diet. *Clim Change* **95**, 83–102.
- Baker S (1996) Sustainable development and consumption: the ambiguities – the Oslo ministerial roundtable conference on sustainable production and consumption, Oslo, 6–10 February 1995. *Env Politics* **5**, 93–99.
- Meybeck A & Gitz V (2017) Sustainable diets within sustainable food systems. *Proc Nutr Soc* **76**, 1–11.
- de Boer J & Aiking H (2019) Strategies towards healthy and sustainable protein consumption: a transition framework at the levels of diets, dishes, and dish ingredients. *Food Qual Prefer* **73**, 171–181.
- O'Mara FP (2011) The significance of livestock as a contributor to global greenhouse gas emissions today and in the near future. *Anim Feed Sci Technol* **166–167**, 7–15.
- Carlsson-Kanyama A & González AD (2009) Potential contributions of food consumption patterns to climate change. *Am J Clin Nutr* **89**, 1704S–1709S.
- Weber CL & Matthews HS (2008) Food-miles and the relative climate impacts of food choices in the United States. *Environ Sci Technol* **42**, 3508–3513.
- Thaler RH & Sunstein CR (2008) *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Benartzi S, Beshears J, Milkman KL *et al.* (2017) Should governments invest more in nudging? *Psychol Sci* **28**, 1041–1055.
- Sunstein CR (2018) 'Better off, as judged by themselves': a comment on evaluating nudges. *Int Rev Econ* **65**, 1–8.
- Thaler RH (2018) From cashews to nudges: the evolution of behavioral economics. *Am Econ Rev* **108**, 1265–1287.
- Guthrie J, Mancino L & Lin CJ (2015) Nudging consumers toward better food choices: Policy approaches to changing food consumption behavior. *Psy and Mark* **32**, 501–511.
- Andrews JC, Netemeyer RG & Burton S (2009) The nutrition elite: do only the highest levels of caloric knowledge, obesity knowledge, and motivation matter in processing nutrition ad claims and disclosures? *J Public Policy Mark* **28**, 41–55.
- Wansink B & Sobal J (2007) Mindless eating: the 200 daily food decision we overlook. *Env Behavior* **39**, 106–123.
- Evans JSBT (2008) Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. *Annu Rev Psychol* **59**, 255–278.
- Kahneman D & Frederick S (2002) Representativeness revisited: attribute substitution in intuitive judgment. In *Heuristics and Biases: The Psychology of Intuitive Judgment*, pp. 49–81 [T Gilovich, D Griffin and D Kahneman, editors]. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vermeir I & Verbeke W (2006) Sustainable food consumption: exploring the consumer 'attitude – behavioral intention' gap. *J Agric Environ Ethics* **19**, 169–194.
- Bucher T, Collins C, Rollo ME *et al.* (2016) Nudging consumers towards healthier choices: a systematic review of positional influences on food choice. *Br J Nutr* **115**, 2252–2263.
- Wilson AL, Buckley E, Buckley JD *et al.* (2016) Nudging healthier food and beverage choices through salience and priming. Evidence from a systematic review. *Food Qual Prefer* **51**, 47–64.
- Tijssen I, Zandstra EH, de Graaf C *et al.* (2017) Why a 'light' product package should not be light blue: effects of package colour on perceived healthiness and attractiveness of sugar- and fat-reduced products. *Food Qual Prefer* **59**, 46–58.
- Vermeer WM, Steenhuis IHM, Leeuwis FH *et al.* (2011) Small portion sizes in worksite cafeterias: do they help consumers to reduce their food intake? *Int J Obes* **35**, 1200–1207.
- Brambila-Macias J, Shankar B, Capacci S *et al.* (2011) Policy interventions to promote healthy eating: a review of what works, what does not, and what is promising. *Food Nutr Bull* **32**, 365–375.
- Vermeer WM, Steenhuis IHM & Seidell JC (2010) Portion size: a qualitative study of consumers' attitudes toward

- point-of-purchase interventions aimed at portion size. *Health Educ Res* **25**, 109–120.
33. Cadario R & Chandon P (2019) Which healthy eating nudges work best? A meta-analysis of field experiments. *Mark Sci* (In the Press).
  34. Costanigro M, Kroll S, Thilmany D *et al.* (2014) Is it love for local/organic or hate for conventional? Asymmetric effects of information and taste on label preferences in an experimental auction. *Food Qual Prefer* **31**, 94–105.
  35. Cowburn G & Stockley L (2005) Consumer understanding and use of nutrition labelling: a systematic review. *Public Health Nutr* **8**, 21–28.
  36. Gruère GP (2013) A characterisation of environmental labelling and information schemes. *J Consum Policy* **62**, 1–42.
  37. Feldmann C & Hamm U (2015) Consumers' perceptions and preferences for local food: a review. *Food Qual Prefer* **40**, 152–164.
  38. Telligman AL, Worosz MR & Bratcher CL (2017) 'Local' as an indicator of beef quality: an exploratory study of rural consumers in the southern U.S. *Food Qual Prefer* **57**, 41–53.
  39. Poelman A, Mojet J, Lyon D *et al.* (2008) The influence of information about organic production and fair trade on preferences for and perception of pineapple. *Food Qual Prefer* **19**, 114–121.
  40. Songa G, Slabbinck H, Vermeir I *et al.* (2019) How do implicit/explicit attitudes and emotional reactions to sustainable logo relate? A neurophysiological study. *Food Qual Prefer* **71**, 485–496.
  41. Hartmann C, Hieke S, Taper C *et al.* (2018) European consumer healthiness evaluation of 'free-from' labelled food products. *Food Qual Prefer* **68**, 377–388.
  42. Milosavljevic M, Navalpakkam V, Koch C *et al.* (2012) Relative visual saliency differences induce sizable bias in consumer choice. *J Consum Psy* **22**, 67–74.
  43. Newell RG & Siikammki J (2013) Nudging energy efficiency behavior: role of information labels. *J Assoc Environ Resour Econ* **1**, 555–598.
  44. Kallbekken S, Saelen H & Hermansen EAT (2013) Bridging the energy efficiency gap: a field experiment on lifetime energy costs and household appliances. *J Consum Policy* **36**, 1–16.
  45. Slabbinck H, Vandenbroele J, Van Kerckhove A *et al.* (2016) *Het Duwtje in de Juiste Richting: Hoe de Vlaamse Consument Begeleiden Naar een Milieuverantwoord Consumptiepatroon*. Brussels: Ghent University Press.
  46. Rainforest Alliance (2019) Our impacts – measurable benefits for forests, farmers and communities. <https://www.rainforest-alliance.org/impact> (accessed January 2019).
  47. Fair Trade Belgium (2019) De basisprincipes van Fairtrade. <https://www.fairtradebelgium.be/eerlijke-handel/de-basisprincipes-van-fairtrade/> (accessed January 2019).
  48. Sörqvist P, Haga A, Langeborg L *et al.* (2015) The green halo: mechanisms and limits of the eco-label effect. *Food Qual Prefer* **43**, 1–9.
  49. Wiedmann K-P, Hennigs N, Behrens SH *et al.* (2014) Tasting green: an experimental design for investigating consumer perception of organic wine. *Br Food J* **116**, 197–211.
  50. Lee H & Yun Z (2015) Consumers' perceptions of organic food attributes and cognitive and affective attitudes as determinants of their purchase intentions toward organic food. *Food Qual Prefer* **39**, 259–267.
  51. Schneider CR, Zaval L, Weber EU *et al.* (2017) The influence of anticipated pride and guilt on pro-environmental decision making. *PLoS ONE* **12**, e0188781.
  52. Antonetti P & Maklan S (2014) Feelings that make a difference: how guilt and pride convince consumers of the effectiveness of sustainable consumption choices. *J Bus Ethics* **124**, 117–134.
  53. Rees JH, Klug S & Bamberg S (2015) Guilty conscience: motivating pro-environmental behavior by inducing negative moral emotions. *Clim Change* **130**, 439–452.
  54. Lu H & Schuldt JP (2015) Exploring the role of incidental emotions in support for climate change policy. *Clim Change* **131**, 719–726.
  55. Verain MCD, Sijtsema SJ & Antonides G (2016) Consumer segmentation based on food-category attribute importance: the relation with healthiness and sustainability perceptions. *Food Qual Prefer* **48**, 99–106.
  56. Kwon W-S, Englis B & Mann M (2016) Are third-party green–brown ratings believed?: The role of prior brand loyalty and environmental concern. *J Bus Res* **69**, 815–822.
  57. Van Doorn J & Verhoef PC (2015) Drivers of and barriers to organic purchase behavior. *J Retail* **91**, 436–450.
  58. Piqueras-Fiszman B & Spence C (2015) Sensory expectations based on product-extrinsic food cues: an interdisciplinary review of the empirical evidence and theoretical accounts. *Food Qual Prefer* **40**, 165–179.
  59. Van Loo EJ, Caputo V, Nayga RM *et al.* (2015) Sustainability labels on coffee: consumer preferences, willingness-to-pay and visual attention to attributes. *Ecol Econ* **118**, 215–225.
  60. Janssen M & Hamm U (2012) Product labelling in the market for organic food: consumer preferences and willingness-to-pay for different organic certification logos. *Food Qual Prefer* **25**, 9–22.
  61. Samant SS & Seo H-S (2016) Effects of label understanding level on consumers' visual attention toward sustainability and process-related label claims found on chicken meat products. *Food Qual Prefer* **50**, 48–56.
  62. Samant SS & Seo H-S (2016) Quality perception and acceptability of chicken breast meat labeled with sustainability claims vary as a function of consumers' label-understanding level. *Food Qual Prefer* **49**, 151–160.
  63. Schuldt JP & Hannahan M (2013) When good deeds leave a bad taste. Negative inferences from ethical food claims. *Appetite* **62**, 76–83.
  64. Lee W-CJ, Shimizu M, Kniffin KM *et al.* (2013) You taste what you see: do organic labels bias taste perceptions? *Food Qual Prefer* **29**, 33–39.
  65. Gorissen K & Weijters B (2016) The negative footprint illusion: perceptual bias in sustainable food consumption. *J Environ Psychol* **45**, 50–65.
  66. Pierrot J, Giovannucci D & Kasterine A (2011) *From Bean to Cup: How Consumer Choice Impacts on Coffee Producers and the Environment*. Geneva: International Trade Centre.
  67. Gadema Z & Oglethorpe D (2011) The use and usefulness of carbon labelling food: a policy perspective from a survey of UK supermarket shoppers. *Food Policy* **36**, 815–822.
  68. Van Loo EJ, Caputo V, Nayga RM *et al.* (2014) Consumers' valuation of sustainability labels on meat. *Food Policy* **49**, 137–150.
  69. Grunert KG, Hieke S & Wills J (2014) Sustainability labels on food products: consumer motivation, understanding and use. *Food Policy* **44**, 177–189.
  70. European Food Information Council (2015) *Global Update on Nutrition Labeling*. Brussels: European Food Information Council.
  71. Sutherland L, Kaley L & Fischer L (2010) Guiding stars: the effect of a nutrition navigation program on consumer purchases at the supermarket. *Am J Clin Nutr* **91**, 1090S–1094S.
  72. Rosi A, Zerbini C, Pellegrini N *et al.* (2017) How to improve food choices through vending machines: the



- importance of healthy food availability and consumers' awareness. *Food Qual Prefer* **62**, 262–269.
73. Cioffi CE, Levitsky DA, Pacanowski CR *et al.* (2015) A nudge in a healthy direction. The effect of nutrition labels on food purchasing behaviors in university dining facilities. *Appetite* **92**, 7–14.
  74. Cho Y-N & Baskin E (2018) It's a match when green meets healthy in sustainability labeling. *J Bus Res* **86**, 119–129.
  75. Hallström E, Davis J, Woodhouse A *et al.* (2018) Using dietary quality scores to assess sustainability of food products and human diets: a systematic review. *Ecol Indic* **93**, 219–230.
  76. Heller MC, Keoleian GA & Willett WC (2013) Toward a life cycle-based, diet-level framework for food environmental impact and nutritional quality assessment: a critical review. *Environ Sci Technol* **47**, 12632–12647.
  77. Vanclay JK, Shortiss J, Aulsebrook S *et al.* (2011) Customer response to carbon labelling of groceries. *J Consum Policy* **34**, 153–160.
  78. Genschow O, Reutner L & Wänke M (2012) The color red reduces snack food and soft drink intake. *Appetite* **58**, 699–702.
  79. Thorndike AN, Sonnenberg L, Riis J *et al.* (2012) A 2-phase labeling and choice architecture intervention to improve healthy food and beverage choices. *Am J Public Health* **102**, 527–533.
  80. Olstad DL, Vermeer J, McCargar LJ *et al.* (2015) Using traffic light labels to improve food selection in recreation and sport facility eating environments. *Appetite* **91**, 329–335.
  81. Thorndike AN, Riis J, Sonnenberg LM *et al.* (2014) Traffic-light labels and choice architecture: promoting healthy food choices. *Am J Prev Med* **46**, 143–149.
  82. Aschemann-Witzel J, Grunert KG, van Trijp HC *et al.* (2013) Effects of nutrition label format and product assortment on the healthfulness of food choice. *Appetite* **71**, 63–74.
  83. Scarborough P, Matthews A, Eyles H *et al.* (2015) Reds are more important than greens: how UK supermarket shoppers use the different information on a traffic light nutrition label in a choice experiment. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **12**, 1–9.
  84. Baumeister RF, Bratslavsky E, Finkenauer C *et al.* (2001) Bad is stronger than good. *Rev Gen* **5**, 323–370.
  85. Reutner L, Genschow O & Wänke M (2015) The adaptive eater: perceived healthiness moderates the effect of the color red on consumption. *Food Qual Prefer* **44**, 172–178.
  86. Hoefkens C, Lachat C, Kolsteren P *et al.* (2011) Posting point-of-purchase nutrition information in university canteens does not influence meal choice and nutrient intake. *Am J Clin Nutr* **94**, 562–570.
  87. Chandon P & Wansink B (2007) The biasing health halos of fast-food restaurant health claims: lower calorie estimates and higher side-dish consumption intentions. *J Consum Res* **34**, 301–314.
  88. Wansink B & Chandon P (2006) Can “low-fat” nutrition labels lead to obesity? *J Mark Res* **43**, 605–617.
  89. Armel KC, Beaumel A & Rangel A (2008) Biasing simple choices by manipulating relative visual attention. *Judgm Decis Mak* **3**, 396–403.
  90. Glanz K, Karpyn A, Wojtanowski AC *et al.* (2014) Placement and promotion strategies to increase sales of healthier products in supermarkets in low-income, ethnically diverse neighborhoods: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* **99**, 1359–1368.
  91. Gamburzew A, Darcel N, Gazan R *et al.* (2016) In-store marketing of inexpensive foods with good nutritional quality in disadvantaged neighborhoods: increased awareness, understanding, and purchasing. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **13**, 104.
  92. Keller C, Markert F & Bucher T (2015) Nudging product choices: the effect of position change on snack bar choice. *Food Qual Prefer* **41**, 41–43.
  93. Kroese FM, Marchiori DR & de Ridder DTD (2016) Nudging healthy food choices: a field experiment at the train station. *J Public Health* **38**, e133–e137.
  94. Dayan E & Bar-Hillel M (2011) Nudge to nobesity II: menu positions influence food orders – ProQuest. *Judgm Decis Mak* **6**, 333–342.
  95. Policastro P, Smith Z & Chapman G (2017) Put the healthy item first: order of ingredient listing influences consumer selection. *J Health Psychol* **22**, 853–863.
  96. Kurz V (2018) Nudging to reduce meat consumption: immediate and persistent effects of an intervention at a university restaurant. *J Environ Econ Manage* **90**, 317–341.
  97. Sadler MJ (2004) Meat alternatives – market developments and health benefits. *Trends Food Sci Technol* **15**, 250–260.
  98. Schösler H, Boer JD & Boersema JJ (2012) Can we cut out the meat of the dish? Constructing consumer-oriented pathways towards meat substitution. *Appetite* **58**, 39–47.
  99. van Kleef E, Otten K & van Trijp HCM (2012) Healthy snacks at the checkout counter: a lab and field study on the impact of shelf arrangement and assortment structure on consumer choices. *BMC Public Health* **12**, 1072.
  100. Pechey R, Cartwright E, Pilling M *et al.* (2018) Impact of increasing the proportion of healthier foods available on energy purchased in worksite cafeterias: a stepped wedge randomized controlled pilot trial. *Appetite* **133**, 286–296.
  101. van Herpen E & Bosmans A (2018) Arranging the assortment to arouse choice: effects of goal-relevant assortment organization on food choice and variety perceptions. *Food Qual Prefer* **64**, 192–204.
  102. Gravely E & Fraser E (2018) Transitions on the shopping floor: investigating the role of Canadian supermarkets in alternative protein consumption. *Appetite* **130**, 146–156.
  103. Vandebroele J, Slabbinck H, Van Kerckhove A *et al.* (2018) Mock meat in the butchery: nudging consumers toward meat substitutes. Conference paper in *Eighth European Conference on Sensory and Consumer Research*. Verona: European Sensory Science Society.
  104. Adise S, Gavdanovich I & Zellner DA (2015) Looks like chicken: exploring the law of similarity in evaluation of foods of animal origin and their vegan substitutes. *Food Qual Prefer* **41**, 52–59.
  105. Hoek AC, Luning PA, Weijzen P *et al.* (2011) Replacement of meat by meat substitutes. A survey on person- and product-related factors in consumer acceptance. *Appetite* **56**, 662–673.
  106. Hoek AC, Pearson D, James SW *et al.* (2017) Healthy and environmentally sustainable food choices: consumer responses to point-of-purchase actions. *Food Qual Prefer* **58**, 94–106.
  107. van Herpen E, Fischer ARH & van Trijp HCM (2015) How to position ‘mildly sustainable’ products: the joint impact of assortment display and price setting. *Food Qual Prefer* **46**, 26–32.
  108. Chandon P, Hutchinson JW, Young SH *et al.* (2009) Does in-store marketing work? Effects of the number and position of shelf facings on brand attention and evaluation at the point of purchase. *J Mark* **73**, 1–17.
  109. Krishna A (2012) An integrative review of sensory marketing: engaging the senses to affect perception, judgment and behavior. *J Consum Psychol* **22**, 332–351.
  110. Bacon L & Krpan D (2018) (Not) Eating for the environment: the impact of restaurant menu design on vegetarian food choice. *Appetite* **125**, 190–200.

111. Olstad D, Goonewardene LA, McCargar LJ *et al.* (2014) Choosing healthier foods in recreational sports settings: a mixed methods investigation of the impact of nudging and an economic incentive. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **11**, 6.
112. Turnwald BP, Boles DZ & Crum AJ (2017) Association between indulgent descriptions and vegetable consumption: twisted carrots and dynamite beets. *JAMA Intern Med* **177**, 1216–1218.
113. Liang P, Roy S, Chen M-L *et al.* (2013) Visual influence of shapes and semantic familiarity on human sweet sensitivity. *Behav Brain Res* **253**, 42–47.
114. Maignier L, Schoormans J & Mugge R (2016) Judging a product by its cover: packaging sustainability and perceptions of quality in food products. *Food Qual Prefer* **53**, 132–142.
115. Zellner DA, Lankford M, Ambrose L *et al.* (2010) Art on the plate: effect of balance and color on attractiveness of, willingness to try and liking for food. *Food Qual Prefer* **21**, 575–578.
116. Raghunathan R, Naylor RW & Hoyer WD (2006) The unhealthy = tasty intuition and its effects on taste inferences, enjoyment, and choice of food products. *J Mark* **70**, 170–184.
117. Werle COC, Trendel O & Ardito G (2013) Unhealthy food is not tastier for everybody: the ‘healthy = tasty’ French intuition. *Food Qual Prefer* **28**, 116–121.
118. Jo J & Lusk JL (2018) If it’s healthy, it’s tasty and expensive: effects of nutritional labels on price and taste expectations. *Food Qual Prefer* **68**, 332–341.
119. Bublitz MG & Peracchio LA (2015) Applying industry practices to promote healthy foods: an exploration of positive marketing outcomes. *J Bus Res* **68**, 2484–2493.
120. Gvili Y, Tal A, Amar M *et al.* (2015) Fresh from the tree: implied motion improves food evaluation. *Food Qual Prefer* **46**, 160–165.
121. Meert K, Pandelaere M & Patrick VM (2014) Taking a shine to it: how the preference for glossy stems from an innate need for water. *J Consum Psychol* **24**, 195–206.
122. Newman RW (1970) Why man is such a sweaty and thirsty naked animal: a speculative review. *Hum Biol* **42**, 12–27.
123. Spence C, Puccinelli NM, Grewal D *et al.* (2014) Store atmospherics: a multisensory perspective. *Psychol Mark* **31**, 472–488.
124. Lange F, Rosengren S & Blom A (2016) Store-window creativity’s impact on shopper behavior. *J Bus Res* **69**, 1014–1021.
125. Stöckli S, Stämpfli AE, Messner C *et al.* (2016) An (un) healthy poster: when environmental cues affect consumers’ food choices at vending machines. *Appetite* **96**, 368–374.
126. Areni CS & Kim D (1994) The influence of in-store lighting on consumers’ examination of merchandise in a wine store. *Int J Res Mark* **11**, 117–125.
127. de Wijk RA, Maaskant AM, Kremer S *et al.* (2018) Supermarket shopper movements versus sales and the effects of scent, light, and sound. *Food Qual Prefer* **70**, 32–39.
128. Sprott DE & Shimp TA (2004) Using product sampling to augment the perceived quality of store brands. *J Retail* **80**, 305–315.
129. Heilman C, Lakishyk K & Radas S (2011) An empirical investigation of in-store sampling promotions. *Br Food J* **113**, 1252–1266.
130. Raudenbush B & Frank RA (1999) Assessing food neophobia: the role of stimulus familiarity. *Appetite* **32**, 261–271.
131. Stefani G, Romano D & Cavicchi A (2006) Consumer expectations, liking and willingness to pay for specialty foods: do sensory characteristics tell the whole story? *Food Qual Prefer* **17**, 53–62.
132. Bernard JC & Liu Y (2017) Are beliefs stronger than taste? A field experiment on organic and local apples. *Food Qual Prefer* **61**, 55–62.
133. Wilcox K, Roggeveen AL & Grewal D (2011) Shall I tell you now or later? Assimilation and contrast in the evaluation of experiential products. *J Consum Res* **38**, 763–773.
134. Biswas D, Grewal D & Roggeveen A (2010) How the order of sampled experiential products affects choice. *J Mark Res* **47**, 508–519.
135. Jain R & Bagdare S (2011) Music and consumption experience: a review. *Int J Retail Distrib Manage* **39**, 289–302.
136. Garlin FV & Owen K (2006) Setting the tone with the tune: a meta-analytic review of the effects of background music in retail settings. *J Bus Res* **59**, 755–764.
137. North AC, Hargreaves DJ & McKendrick J (1999) The influence of in-store music on wine selections. *J Appl Psychol* **84**, 271–276.
138. Baker J, Grewal D & Parasuraman A (1994) The influence of store environment on quality inferences and store image. *J Acad Mark Sci* **22**, 328–339.
139. Areni S & Kim C (1993) The influence of music on shopping behavior: classical versus top-forty music in a wine store. In *Advances in Consumer Research*, pp. 336–340 [L McAlister and ML Rothschild, editors]. Provo: Association for Consumer Research.
140. Milliman RE (1982) Using background music to affect the behavior of supermarket shoppers. *J Mark* **46**, 86–91.
141. Spendrup S, Hunter E & Isgren E (2016) Exploring the relationship between nature sounds, connectedness to nature, mood and willingness to buy sustainable food: a retail field experiment. *Appetite* **100**, 133–141.
142. Peck J & Childers TL (2003) Individual differences in haptic information processing: the ‘need for touch’ scale. *J Consum Res* **30**, 430–442.
143. Peck J & Childers TL (2003) To have and to hold: the influence of haptic information on product judgments. *J Mark* **67**, 35–48.
144. Peck J & Shu SB (2009) The effect of mere touch on perceived ownership. *J Consum Res* **36**, 434–447.
145. de Vries R, Jager G, Tijssen I *et al.* (2018) Shopping for products in a virtual world: why haptics and visuals are equally important in shaping consumer perceptions and attitudes. *Food Qual Prefer* **66**, 64–75.
146. Argo J, Dahl D & Morales A (2006) Consumer contamination: how consumers react to products touched by others. *J Mark* **70**, 81–94.
147. Morales AC & Fitzsimons GJ (2007) Product contagion: changing consumer evaluations through physical contact with ‘disgusting’ products. *J Mark Res* **44**, 272–283.
148. Huyghe E, Verstraeten J, Geuens M *et al.* (2017) Clicks as a healthy alternative to bricks: how online grocery shopping reduces vice purchases. *J Mark Res* **54**, 61–74.
149. Shen H, Zhang M & Krishna A (2016) Computer interfaces and the ‘direct-touch’ effect: can iPads increase the choice of hedonic food? *J Mark Res* **53**, 745–758.
150. Buck LB (2005) Unraveling the sense of smell (Nobel lecture). *Angew Chem Int Ed* **44**, 6128–6140.
151. Krishna A, Lwin MO & Morrin M (2010) Product scent and memory. *J Consum Res* **37**, 57–67.
152. Bradford KD & Desrochers DM (2009) The use of scents to influence consumers: the sense of using scents to make cents. *J Bus Ethics* **90**(suppl 2), 141–153.

153. Spangenberg ER, Crowley AE & Henderson PW (1996) Improving the store environment: do olfactory cues affect evaluations and behaviors? *J Mark* **60**, 67–80.
154. Bosmans A (2006) Scents and sensibility: when do (in) congruent ambient scents influence product evaluations? *J Mark* **70**, 32–43.
155. Mors MR, Polet IA, Vingerhoeds MH *et al.* (2018) Can food choice be influenced by priming with food odours? *Food Qual Prefer* **66**, 148–152.
156. de Wijk RA, Smeets PAM, Polet IA *et al.* (2018) Aroma effects on food choice task behavior and brain responses to bakery food product cues. *Food Qual Prefer* **68**, 304–314.
157. Griskevicius V, Tybur JM & Van den Bergh B (2010) Going green to be seen: status, reputation, and conspicuous conservation. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **98**, 392–404.
158. Cerri J, Thøgersen J & Testa F (2019) Social desirability and sustainable food research: a systematic literature review. *Food Qual Prefer* **71**, 136–140.
159. Cialdini RB & Trost MR (1998) Social influence: social norms, conformity, and compliance. In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, pp. 151–192 [D Gilbert, S Fiske and G Lindzey, editors]. New York: McGraw-Hill.
160. Schultz PW, Nolan JM, Cialdini RB *et al.* (2007) The constructive, destructive, and reconstructive power of social norms. *Psychol Sci* **18**, 429–434.
161. Cialdini RB (2003) Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* **12**, 105–109.
162. Ketron S & Naletelich K (2019) Victim or beggar? Anthropomorphic messengers and the savior effect in consumer sustainability behavior. *J Bus Res* **96**, 73–84.
163. Cooremans K & Geuens M (2019) Same but different: using anthropomorphism in the battle against food waste. *J Public Policy Mark* **38**, 232–245.
164. Elgaaiied-Gambier L, Monnot E & Reniou F (2018) Using descriptive norm appeals effectively to promote green behavior. *J Bus Res* **82**, 179–191.
165. Melnyk V, van Herpen E, Fischer ARH *et al.* (2013) Regulatory fit effects for injunctive versus descriptive social norms: evidence from the promotion of sustainable products. *Mark Lett* **24**, 191–203.
166. Demarque C, Charalambides L, Hilton DJ *et al.* (2015) Nudging sustainable consumption: the use of descriptive norms to promote a minority behavior in a realistic online shopping environment. *J Environ Psychol* **43**, 166–174.
167. Momsen K & Stoerk T (2014) From intention to action: can nudges help consumers to choose renewable energy? *Energy Policy* **74**, 376–382.
168. Abrahamse W & Steg L (2013) Social influence approaches to encourage resource conservation: a meta-analysis. *Glob Environ Change* **23**, 1773–1785.
169. Rettie R, Burchell K & Riley D (2012) Normalising green behaviours: a new approach to sustainability marketing. *J Mark Management* **28**, 420–444.
170. Osbaldiston R & Schott JP (2012) Environmental sustainability and behavioral science. *Environ Behav* **44**, 257–299.
171. Kristensson P, Wästlund E & Söderlund M (2017) Influencing consumers to choose environment friendly offerings: evidence from field experiments. *J Bus Res* **76**, 89–97.
172. Sprott DE, Spangenberg ER, Block LG *et al.* (2006) The question–behavior effect: what we know and where we go from here. *Soc Influ* **1**, 128–137.
173. van Kleef E, van den Broek O & van Trijp HCM (2015) Exploiting the spur of the moment to enhance healthy consumption: verbal prompting to increase fruit choices in a self-service restaurant. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being* **7**, 149–166.
174. Puska P, Kurki S, Lähdesmäki M *et al.* (2018) Sweet taste of prosocial status signaling: when eating organic foods makes you happy and hopeful. *Appetite* **121**, 348–359.
175. Hartmann C, Ruby MB, Schmidt P *et al.* (2018) Brave, health-conscious, and environmentally friendly: positive impressions of insect food product consumers. *Food Qual Prefer* **68**, 64–71.
176. Robinson E, Thomas J, Aveyard P *et al.* (2014) What everyone else is eating: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of informational eating norms on eating behavior. *J Acad Nutr Diet* **114**, 414–429.
177. Ellison B (2014) ‘I’ll have what he’s having’: group ordering behavior in food choice decisions. *Food Qual Prefer* **37**, 79–86.
178. Valenzuela A & Raghuram P (2009) Position-based beliefs: the center-stage effect. *J Consum Psychol* **19**, 185–196.
179. Missbach B & König JS (2016) Middle choice preference and snack choice: the role of self-regulatory resources to nudge healthier food choice. *Food Qual Prefer* **53**, 127–131.
180. Parker JR & Lehmann DR (2011) When shelf-based scarcity impacts consumer preferences. *J Retail* **87**, 142–155.
181. Kongsbak I, Skov LR, Nielsen BK *et al.* (2016) Increasing fruit and vegetable intake among male university students in an ad libitum buffet setting: a choice architectural nudge intervention. *Food Qual Prefer* **49**, 183–188.
182. Rozin P, Scott S, Dingley M *et al.* (2011) Nudge to nobesity I: minor changes in accessibility decrease food intake. *Judgm Decis Mak* **6**, 323–332.
183. de Wijk RA, Maaskant AJ, Polet IA *et al.* (2016) An in-store experiment on the effect of accessibility on sales of wholegrain and white bread in supermarkets. *PLoS ONE* **11**, e0151915.
184. Broers VJV, Van den Broucke S, Taverne C *et al.* (2019) Investigating the conditions for the effectiveness of nudging: cue-to-action nudging increases familiar vegetable choice. *Food Qual Prefer* **71**, 366–374.
185. Privitera GJ & Zuraikat FM (2014) Proximity of foods in a competitive food environment influences consumption of a low calorie and a high calorie food. *Appetite* **76**, 175–179.
186. Maas J, de Ridder DTD, de Vet E *et al.* (2012) Do distant foods decrease intake? The effect of food accessibility on consumption. *Psychol Health* **27**(suppl 2), 59–73.
187. Baskin E, Gorlin M, Chance Z *et al.* (2016) Proximity of snacks to beverages increases food consumption in the workplace: a field study. *Appetite* **103**, 244–248.
188. Meiselman HL, Hedderley D, Staddon SL *et al.* (1994) Effect of effort on meal selection and meal acceptability in a student cafeteria. *Appetite* **23**, 43–55.
189. Knowles D, Brown K & Aldrovandi S (2018) Exploring the underpinning mechanisms of the proximity effect within a competitive food environment. *Appetite* **134**, 94–102.
190. Goldstein DG, Johnson EJ, Herrmann A *et al.* (2008) Nudge your customers toward better choices. *Harv Bus Rev* **86**, 99–105.
191. Loeb KL, Radnitz C, Keller K *et al.* (2017) The application of defaults to optimize parents’ health-based choices for children. *Appetite* **113**, 368–375.
192. van Kleef E, Seijdel K, Vingerhoeds MH *et al.* (2018) The effect of a default-based nudge on the choice of whole wheat bread. *Appetite* **121**, 179–185.
193. Bergeron S, Doyon M, Saulais L *et al.* (2018) Using insights from behavioral economics to nudge individuals towards healthier choices when eating out: a restaurant experiment. *Food Qual Prefer* **73**, 56–64.



194. Lombardini C & Lankoski L (2013) Forced choice restriction in promoting sustainable food consumption: intended and unintended effects of the mandatory vegetarian day in Helsinki schools. *J Consum Policy* **36**, 159–178.
195. Huyghe E, Geuens M & Vermeir I (2017) To squeeze or not to squeeze: how squeeze tubes affect consumers' serving sizes. *Appetite* **111**, 56–62.
196. De Bondt C, Van Kerckhove A & Geuens M (2017) 'My lips are sealed' – the impact of package resealability on the consumption of tempting foods. *Appetite* **117**, 143–151.
197. von Germeten J-P & Hirsch S (2015) Pre-sliced or do it yourself? – Determinants of schoolchildren's acceptance of convenience fruits and vegetables. *Food Qual Prefer* **44**, 1–11.
198. Carroll KA, Samek A & Zepeda L (2018) Food bundling as a health nudge: investigating consumer fruit and vegetable selection using behavioral economics. *Appetite* **121**, 237–248.
199. Steenhuis IHM, Leeuwis FH & Vermeer WM (2010) Small, medium, large or supersize: trends in food portion sizes in The Netherlands. *Public Health Nutr* **13**, 852–857.
200. Zlatevska N, Dubelaar C & Holden SS (2014) Sizing up the effect of portion size on consumption: a meta-analytic review. *J Mark* **78**, 140–154.
201. Hollands GJ, Shemilt I, Marteau TM *et al.* (2015) Portion, package or tableware size for changing selection and consumption of food, alcohol and tobacco. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* **9**, CD011045.
202. Schwartz J, Riis J, Elbel B *et al.* (2012) Inviting consumers to downsize fast-food portions significantly reduces calorie consumption. *Health Aff* **31**, 399–407.
203. Vandenbroele J, Slabbinck H, Van Kerckhove A *et al.* (2018) Curbing portion size effects by adding smaller portions at the point of purchase. *Food Qual Prefer* **64**, 82–87.
204. Miller N, Reicks M, Redden JP *et al.* (2015) Increasing portion sizes of fruits and vegetables in an elementary school lunch program can increase fruit and vegetable consumption. *Appetite* **91**, 426–430.
205. do Vale RC, Pieters R & Zeelenberg M (2008) Flying under the radar: perverse package size effects on consumption self-regulation. *J Consum Res* **35**, 380–390.
206. Rowley J & Spence C (2018) Does the visual composition of a dish influence the perception of portion size and hedonic preference? *Appetite* **128**, 79–86.
207. Rolls BJ, Roe LS, Halverson KH *et al.* (2007) Using a smaller plate did not reduce energy intake at meals. *Appetite* **49**, 652–660.
208. Libotte E, Siegrist M & Bucher T (2014) The influence of plate size on meal composition. Literature review and experiment. *Appetite* **82**, 91–96.
209. Aydinoglu NZ & Krishna A (2011) Guiltless gluttony: the asymmetric effect of size labels on size perceptions and consumption. *J Consum Res* **37**, 1095–1112.
210. Szaszi B, Palinkas A, Palfi B *et al.* (2018) A systematic scoping review of the choice architecture movement: toward understanding when and why nudges work. *J Behav Decis Mak* **31**, 355–366.
211. Meder B, Fleischhut N & Osman M (2018) Beyond the confines of choice architecture: a critical analysis. *J Econ Psychol* **68**, 36–44.
212. Smith NC, Goldstein DG & Johnson EJ (2013) Choice without awareness: ethical and policy implications of defaults. *J Public Policy Mark* **32**, 159–172.
213. Rebonato R (2014) A critical assessment of libertarian paternalism. *J Consum Policy* **37**, 357–396.