HAL
open science

A horse on your plate? A cluster analysis of French consumers hippophagy acceptance

Maxime Sebbane, Céline Vial, Arnaud Lamy

▶ To cite this version:

HAL Id: hal-04095090
https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04095090

Submitted on 12 May 2023

A horse on your plate?

A cluster analysis of French consumers hippophagy acceptance

Maxime SEBBANE[1,3], Céline VIAL[1,2], Arnaud LAMY[1,3],

[1] MoISA, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, CIHEAM- IAMM, INRAE, Institut Agro, IRD, Montpellier, France

[2] Institut Français du Cheval et de l'Equitation, pôle Développement Innovation Recherche, Saumur, France.

[3] Centre de recherche de l'Institut Paul Bocuse, Ecully, France

Maxime SEBBANE ORCID : 0000-0001-6867-3058

Céline VIAL   ORCID : 0000-0002-5442-4015

Arnaud LAMY   ORCID : 0000-0002-1128-5465

CORRESPONDENCE

Maxime Sebbane, MoISA, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, CIHEAM- IAMM, INRAE, Institute Agro, IRD, 2 Place Pierre Viala, 34060 Montpellier Cedex 1 France. maxime.sebbane@supagro.fr

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data available on request from the authors

1 **A horse on your plate?**

2 **A cluster analysis of consumers hippophagy acceptance**

3

4 **Abstract**

5 Hippophagy is a practice that is far from being consensual, even among meat eaters. Horse

6 meat consumption remains limited or is even strongly declining in some countries such as

7 France. However, the nutritional, organoleptic and environmental benefits of this meat invite

8 us to consider horse meat products as a valuable alternative source of protein. This research

9 therefore aims to identify and characterize different profiles of consumers and non-consumers

10 of horse meat in terms of personal values, attitudes, motivations and behaviors. Based on data

11 from a quantitative survey among 482 French meat consumers, we distinguish 4 categories of

12 individuals: "Enthusiast", "Distant", "Aversive" and "Potential". While "Distant" and

13 "Aversive" show a low level of acceptability towards horse meat, "Enthusiast" and "Potential"

14 reveal characteristics that are favorable to horse meat consumption. Targeted strategies to

15 support the horse meat market are proposed and discussed in light of these results that also

16 provide insight into the future for meat in general.

17

18 KEYWORDS: Consumer behavior, Cluster analysis, Horse meat consumption

19

20 **1**   **Introduction**

21   Humans' relationship with meat is particularly complex and ambivalent. Meat is a valuable

22   source of protein and a sought-after palatable food associated with symbolic representations

23   of strength, power and masculinity (Dowsett et al., 2018; Ruby & Heine, 2011). Yet, loving

24   animals and killing them for food poses a moral dilemma that creates a cognitive dissonance,

25   also called "meat paradox". (Benningstad & Kunst, 2020; Dowsett et al., 2018; Lin-Schilstra

26   & Fischer, 2020). More recently, the consumption and production of meat arouses

27   increasingly pressing questions about the sustainability of our food models (e.g., Willett *et al.*,

28   2019). In particular, the central place of red meat from intensive feedlots in the diets of

29   Westerners is being challenged due to its detrimental impacts on the planet, animal welfare,

30   and human health (Westhoek et al., 2014; Wiart et al., 2022; Willett et al., 2019).

31   Changing consumer behavior towards beef may provide a consumption opportunity for

32   unfamiliar red meats from alternative animal species such as game, elk, kangaroo, ostrich, or

33   horses (Popoola et al., 2020). Among these, horse meat represents a niche market that offers

34   opportunities to develop supplementary high-quality red meat with less impact on the

35   environment than beef (Balji et al., 2020; Jastrzębska et al., 2019; Lorenzo et al., 2014;

36   Rzekęć et al., 2020).

37   Compared to cattle, equines are non-ruminant herbivores that emit five times less methane

38   into the atmosphere, making their meat production a more climate-friendly source of food

39   (Franz et al., 2010; Moss et al., 2000; Rzekęć et al., 2020). In terms of biodiversity, the

40   breeding of draught horses for slaughter enables the conservation of several local breeds

41   threatened with extinction and therefore helps to preserve the genetic diversity and the

42   resilience of domestic species (Belaunzaran et al., 2015). In addition, extensive horse farms in

43   Europe contribute to the maintenance of grasslands and sensitive areas and to the touristic

44   appeal of rural landscapes, while ensuring high standards of animal welfare (Insausti et al.,

45   2021; Rzekęć et al., 2020). Finally, when sanitary conditions allow, the slaughtering and

46 human consumption of horses from sport, leisure, or racing sectors is an interesting

47 alternative to euthanasia, which avoids meat wastage, ensures an economic residual value to

48 horses until the end of their life, and is an improvement for the horse's welfare compared to

49 abandonment and starving (Jez et al., 2013; Whiting, 2007).

50 Nutritionally, horse meat, compared to pork, beef, or poultry, is characterized by low levels of

51 fat and cholesterol, higher concentrations of heme iron, polyunsaturated fatty acids (omega 3

52 and 6) and proteins, making this meat a particularly healthy food (Balji et al., 2020;

53 Belaunzaran et al., 2015, 2017; Lorenzo et al., 2014; Poławska et al., 2013). Finally, the

54 sensory profile of horse meat differs little from beef in terms of aroma and flavor (Popoola et

55 al., 2019; Rødbotten et al., 2004) and its dark red color, extreme tenderness and slightly sweet

56 taste are potentially attractive organoleptic properties for red meat consumers (Balji et al.,

57 2020; Lorenzo et al., 2014; Oh et al., 2009).

58 Despite the benefits of this meat, worldwide production of horse meat represents only 0.25%

59 of the global meat market; and the average available consumption is about 0.10 kg per capita

60 (Belaunzaran et al., 2015).

61 While extensive literature has closely examined beliefs, attitudes, and practices associated

62 with commonly consumed categories of meat, such as beef, chicken, and pork, horse meat as

63 a specific category of alternative red meat is poorly documented. The aim of the present

64 research is to address this gap. More precisely, we investigate the individual characteristics of

65 consumers and non-consumers of horse meat in France. Within Europe, France is the only

66 country, along with Spain, to produce, export, slaughter, and consume horse meat on its

67 territory (FranceAgriMer, 2015). France is one of the main importers and exporters of horse

68 meat on the global market, and one of the countries where the mean consumption of horse

69 meat per capita is higher than the world average (Belaunzaran et al., 2015). However, French

70 horse meat consumption has fallen by a factor of 20 over the last 50 years going from 1.73kg

71 per capita per year in 1970 to 0.09kg per capita per year in 2020 (IFCE 2011, 2021). Half of

72 the distribution of this meat is equally split between specialized butchers and supermarkets

73 and hypermarkets, with direct sales representing a very small share (Cazes-Valette, 2008).

74 The number of horse butchers in France is steadily decreasing, with 750 counted in 2014 by

75 the Federation of French horse butchers[1]. This dramatic drop suggests that some French

76 people no longer consider horse as meat edible and even for those who are likely to consume

77 it, barriers such as lack of knowledge or low availability contribute to the disappearance of

78 this meat from their food repertoire.

79 Several levers and barriers of acceptance and consumption of horse meat can be considered.

80 At a macro level, socio-technical and cultural factors like religion and public policy have

81 influenced the relationship that humans have with horses, and has governed the acceptance

82 and consumption of horse meat throughout the centuries (Whiting, 2007). In the 19th century,

83 considered as inexpensive, healthy and nutritious, horse meat was progressively legally

84 authorized for human consumption in several European countries (Belaunzaran et al., 2015;

85 Digard, 2012; Lamy & Vial-Pion, 2020; Lizet, 2010). Nowadays, hippophagy faces different

86 socio-technical and economic changes inducing a reduction in its consumption (Jez et al.,

87 2013). Access to meat in general has become more democratic and the price of beef has

88 decreased while that of horse meat has increased to become the most expensive meat product

89 (IFCE, 2021). It has also become increasingly difficult to source and buy horse meat (Bigot et

90 al., 2018; Jez et al., 2013; Leteux, 2005). Moreover, throughout the 20th century, the

91 evolution of the uses of the horse in Western societies - from a working and breeding animal

92 to a sporting and recreation animal - has considerably modified the representations of humans

93 towards horses, switching from an edible animal for human consumption to a pet

94 inappropriate for it (Lizet, 2010; Jaskari, Leipämaa-Leskinen and Syrjälä, 2015).

---

[1] https://france3-regions.francetvinfo.fr/auvergne-rhone-alpes/2014/10/03/quel-avenir-pour-la-consommation-de-viande-de-cheval-564274.html

95   At a micro level, two main types of considerations can shape the acceptability of a food

96   product (Font-i-Furnols & Guerrero, 2014; Köster, 2009a; Verbeke & Viaene, 1999). First,

97   ethical and moral considerations refer to a set of variables with affective and emotional

98   components. A general negative or ambivalent representation of meats and animals, negative

99   feelings such as guilt, worry or disgust are generally associated with meat avoidance. For

100   example, Lamy et al. (2022) show that a high level of affective attachment to horses interferes

101   with individuals' representations of horse meat and limits the intention to consume this

102   product. Popoola and colleagues (2021), in a quantitative survey that compared the

103   perceptions of three red meats - beef, bison and horse meat – among Canadian consumers,

104   showed that horse meat was associated to a pet that is cruel, unethical and socially

105   unacceptable to eat, and that people tend to express a feeling of disgust towards horse meat.

106   The second type of acceptability factors refer to the perceived characteristics of the meat,

107   ranging from the intrinsic properties in terms of sensory and organoleptic qualities, nutritional

108   or environmental benefits, to extrinsic attributes such as production organization, price,

109   availability and market positioning (Font-i-Furnols & Guerrero, 2014; Verbeke, Sans, et al.,

110   2015). Thus, consumer attitudes influence individuals' partiality for a set of different meat

111   attributes, moving towards or away from it (Verbeke, Marcu, et al., 2015). For example,

112   although individuals do not tend to distinguish between the sensory characteristics of beef and

113   horse meat, for consumers of the latter, tenderness, juiciness and flavor are inherent positive

114   factors that drive preference and taste for this meat (Popoola et al., 2020) while safety, price,

115   origin and leanness have been identified as critical attributes of horse meat among Korean

116   consumers (Oh et al., 2009).

117   However, consumer attitudes towards food products are usually formed based on prior

118   experience and habits (Verbeke & Vackier, 2004). The evaluation of meat attributes therefore

119   varies according to the level of familiarity with the meat and the willingness to try unfamiliar

120   products. In particular, with respect to horse meat consumption, it is worth highlighting that

121 individuals are largely unfamiliar with this product and the lack of availability in the market

122 environment limits their exposure and in turn the opportunities to encourage them to try it

123 (Lamy et al., 2022; Popoola et al., 2020, 2021b).

124 A better understanding of consumer and non-consumer profiles is therefore needed. What

125 motivates people to consume horse meat or not? Who are the current French consumers of

126 horse meat? Among the non-consumers, are there profiles that would consider adding horse

127 meat to their diet? Guided by these questions, we present the results of a cluster analysis that

128 aims to identify and characterize different profiles of consumers and non-consumers in terms

129 of personal values, attitudes, motivations and behaviors. In doing so, this work sheds light on

130 the potential levers and obstacles to horse meat consumption in order to develop marketing

131 strategies designed for the different consumer segments.

132 The following sections outline the methodology and results of the study before discussing the

133 theoretical and managerial implications of the research.

134

135 2 Materials and methods

136 The results reported here were obtained in the course of a larger study about consumer

137 motives and barriers regarding horse meat consumption, including qualitative (see Lamy *et*

138 *al.*, 2022) and quantitative studies.

139

140 2.1 Sample

141 Thanks to the first results of the program based on qualitative interviews among consumers

142 and non-consumers of horse meat (Lamy et al., 2022), a questionnaire was created to conduct

143   a survey among meat consumers. The questionnaire was disseminated in France in 2020,

144   online via social networks (Facebook, LinkedIn) and mail shots. Prior to the survey itself,

145   participants were asked to give their consent to participate in the study and were informed that

146   they could stop at any time. They were also informed that the study was anonymous and that

147   the data would be analyzed at the group level. The study was conducted in accordance with

148   the regulation of the EU General Data Protection Regulation.

149   A total of 482 valid questionnaires were analyzed. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the

150   sample. Distributions of gender, age, education, and family composition show that the sample

151   covers a wide range of respondents, though without being statistically representative of the

152   French population.

153153

154   **Table 1. Characteristics of the valid sample (% of respondents, n=482)**

155155

156   2.2   Measurements

157   **Meat and horse meat consumption** were measured by asking participants to answer the

158   following questions « How often do you eat meat? » and « How often do you eat horse

159   meat? » on a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 0 'never' to 4 'every day'. Vegetarians

160   were excluded from the study. In the analysis, the variable regarding horse meat consumption

161   was dichotomized in order to distinguish individuals who do not currently eat horse meat

162   (value =0) from individuals who eat horse meat more or less regularly (value =1). For

163   individuals who reported never eating horse meat, an additional question asked them whether

164   they had ever tasted it and if so, if it was during childhood or adulthood. Finally, horse meat

165   consumers were also asked where they usually purchase their horse meat.

166   **Personal norm** is generally understood as personal values that result in a sense of moral

167   obligation to act in a certain way (Schwartz, 1977). Personal norm towards horse meat

168   consumption was measured using three items: "Eating horse meat is in line with my values",

169   "In my opinion, eating horse meat is not moral," "I would feel guilty if I ate horse meat," on a

170   5-point scale from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree' and middle anchor 3 'neither

171   agree nor disagree'. The last two items were reverse coded prior to calculating the mean of the

172   three items (α=.90). The closer the mean value to 5, the less individuals report a personal

173   norm opposed to horse meat consumption.

174   The **meat attachment** scale reflects the multi-dimensional components that characterize the

175   psychological place of meat consumption in food practices. In the present study, we use the

176   MAQ (Circus & Robison, 2019; Lentz et al., 2018) to characterize consumers based on

177   individual differences in consumer appraisal of meat in general, and thus take into account the

178   broader psychological relationship that people have with meat. A scale was included to

179   measure to what extent people feel attached to meat products in terms of hedonism, affinity,

180   entitlement and dependence (Circus & Robison, 2019; Graça et al., 2015). Participants were

181   asked to rate 15 statements, on a scale from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree', and

182   middle anchor 3 'neither agree nor disagree'. The hedonism subscale comprised four

183   statements including "You can't beat a good steak" and " Eating meat is one of life's simple

184   pleasures". The affinity subscale comprised four statements, which were all reverse coded for

185   analyses such as "I feel bad when I think of eating meat" and "Eating meat is disrespectful

186   towards life and the environment". The entitlement subscale was comprised of three

187   statements: "According to our position in the food chain, we have a right to eat meat", "To eat

188   meat is an unquestionable right", and "Eating meat is a natural and indisputable practice".

189   Lastly, the dependence subscale was made up of four statements including "Meat is

190   irreplaceable in my diet", "I would feel fine with a meatless diet" (item reversed for analysis).

191   Since the four subscales, hedonism (α=.88), affinity (α=0.80), entitlement (α=0.79) and

192   dependence (α=0.79) show high internal consistency, each group of statements was averaged

193   to create a subscale score.

194   The **disgust** scale developed by Rozin and Fallon (Rozin & Fallon, 1980) has been adapted to

195   examine whether horse meat products generate aversion and may vary among consumer

196   segments. In line with the authors, 8 statements including "The thought of eating horse meat

197   makes me nauseous", and "I dislike horse meat because of the idea of what it is or where it

198 comes from" were evaluated on a 5-point scale from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly

199 agree' and middle anchor 3 'neither agree nor disagree' (α =.92).

200 **Objective knowledge** characterizes the stored information and its organization in the

201 memory, that is, what the consumer actually knows about the product (Banović et al., 2012).

202 To assess consumers' knowledge of horse meat, we developed a knowledge questionnaire

203 derived from previous exploratory interviews with 23 consumers and exchanges with experts

204 in the equine sector. People were asked to answer "true", "false" or "don't know" to nine

205 statements about the horse meat industry, including on livestock, environmental benefits and

206 nutritional properties of horse meat (see appendix 1). For each respondent, the total number of

207 correct responses was calculated to generate a 9-point knowledge score.

208 **Attitude** was studied through a consumer evaluation of meat attributes, adapted from prior

209 published studies on attitude towards fresh meat (Banović et al., 2009; Verbeke & Viaene,

210 1999). Some of the items identified in the above-mentioned papers were removed because

211 respondents found them confusing during the test questionnaire. In the final version,

212 participants were asked to rate 8 horse meat attributes: quality, taste, health benefit, presence

213 of harmful substances, trust in the product, respect for animal welfare, ease of cooking and

214 safety on a 7-point semantic differential scale (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957) with end

215 points associated with bipolar labels from -3 to +3. In the analysis, the score of each attribute

216 and an aggregate score of attitude equal to the average of all attributes (α=.84) has been used

217 to describe consumer segments. In terms of interpretation, the more the responses tend

218 towards a value of 3, the more the respondent reports a favorable attitude towards horse meat.

219 **Social norm,** (Ajzen, 1991) or the subjective feeling of peer pressure regarding horse meat

220 consumption has been obtained through responses to three items: " My family approves of me

221 eating horse meat", "My friends approve of me eating horse meat" and "People who are

222 important to me think I should not eat horse meat". They have been scored on a 5-point scale

223 from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree' with middle anchor 3 'neither agree nor

224 disagree'. The last item was reverse coded prior to calculating the mean of the 3 items

225 (α=.72). Thus, the closer individuals are to 5, the more they express a subjective social norm

226 supportive of horse meat consumption.

227 **Purchase facility** captured the extent to which individuals are able to source and buy horse

228 meat in their market environment. Respondents were asked to evaluate the following 3 items

229 on a 5–point scale from 1 'very easy' to 5 'very difficult' : "Sourcing horse meat near where I

230 live" "Sourcing horse meat in my usual shopping areas", "Sourcing horse meat in

231 restaurants". Sufficient internal reliability (α=.73) allowed us to use the average score of the

232 three items to identify differences among consumer profiles.

233 Finally, the questionnaire included relevant sociodemographic characteristics like age, gender,

234 education and presence of children in the household as presented in Table 1.

235 The questionnaire was pre-tested and refined before being disseminated online.

236

237 2.3   Classification

238 3 variables were used to classify individuals: the frequency of meat consumption, consumer

239 or non-consumer of horse meat, and personal norm towards horse meat consumption[2].

240 To classify the respondents, a two-step cluster analysis procedure (Chiu et al., 2001) available

241 in SPSS (V25) was applied. This mixed-method approach involves creating a pre-grouping of

242 observations into a large number of classes using a partitioning algorithm similar to K-Means,

243 and then performing a hierarchical aggregation of these pre-classes using a log-likelihood

244 based measure (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2011, p. 259). Less commonly used than hierarchical or

245 dynamic clustering methods, this approach offers the advantage of dealing simultaneously

---

[2] This choice is based on the following reasoning. Attitude towards a food product is the result of past experiences and consumption habits (Köster, 2009b). Therefore, a segmentation that takes into account the frequency of meat consumption (as a food category) and of horse meat (as a specific product within the meat category) is relevant to

explore attitudinal differences towards horse meat. In addition to these two behavioral variables, taking into account moral conviction allows us to distinguish between individuals morally opposed to horse meat consumption and those for whom it remains morally acceptable.

246 with qualitative and quantitative variables (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2011, p. 259), which is

247 appropriate in our case study. Furthermore, the classification results are accompanied by a

248 silhouette measure of intra-group cohesion and inter-group distance to guide the often delicate

249 choice of the number of classes to retain (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2011).

250 The classification being sensitive to the order of the observations, the procedure was repeated

251 5 times by randomly modifying the order of the subjects.

252 A 4-class typology was considered the optimal solution in terms of group size, and

253 interpretability. The silhouette measure, with an average value of 0.5, indicates that intra-class

254 cohesion and inter-class distance are of good quality (Rousseeuw, 1987). In order to detect

255 differences on key dimensions among segments, a set of ANOVA and χ^2 tests was conducted

256 on classification and illustrative variables. In all tests, the statistical significance was

2572 considered significant at $p < 0.05$.
5
7

2582
5
8

259 **3 Results**

260 Firstly, we present meat and horse meat consumption among the sample, which allows us to

261 subsequently categorize it into four segments. Within each segment, psychological and then

262 external factors related to horse meat acceptance are then analyzed, followed by motivations

263 and finally by sociodemographic profiles.

264 3.1 Meat and horse meat consumption among the sample

265 The consumption frequencies of meat and horse meat among respondents are presented in

266 table 1.

267 Among the sample, 44.2% claimed to eat meat on a daily basis and 41.9% several times a

268 week. A majority of the respondents (83.8%) reported never eating horse meat. Nevertheless,

269 among these non-consumers, 54% have already tasted horse meat, most during their

270   childhood (table 2).

271 Horse meat consumers totaled 16.2% of the sample. 14.2% stated eating horse meat less than

272 once a month while only 2.0% reported a more frequent consumption. For consumers,

273 preferred points of purchase were horse butcher shops (44.9%) and general butcher shops

2742 (33.3%), followed by supermarkets (30.4%) and direct purchase from producers (17.7%).
7
4

2752
7
5

276 3.2　　Description and characterization of the segments

277 Cluster analysis based on meat and horse meat consumption along with personal norm makes

278 it possible to class respondents into four relatively homogeneous groups. Table 2 describes

279 the segments based on these three classification variables. Mean scores to meat attachment are

280 also presented to further characterize the four profiles in terms of psychological relation to

281 meat in general.

282282

283 **Table 2. Description and characterization of the Segments (S) based on the classification variables and**

284 **meat attachment scales**

285285

286 The **first segment** (16.2% of the sample) totaled the 78 respondents who reported eating

287 horse meat on a more or less regular basis. With the highest mean score on personal norm

288 towards horse meat (M=4.38), these consumers consistently expressed moral convictions that

289 are not opposed to hippophagy. Compared to the other segments, they reported a significantly

290 higher frequency of consumption of meat in general (3.60) as well as a greater psychological

291 attachment to meat products (3.96). The other three segments included only non-consumers of

292 horse meat who nevertheless presented distinct behavioral and psychological profiles. Non-

293 consumers in **segment 2** were the largest cluster accounting for 36.2% of the sample. They

294 were not morally opposed to hippophagy despite a slightly lower score on personal norm

295 (4.00) than consumers in segment 1. With regards to meat in general, they reported a lower

16

296   frequency of meat consumption (3.49) than segment 1, but higher than segment 3 and

297 comparable to segment 4. Individuals of this group showed overall lower psychological

298 attachment to meat (3.74) than segment 1, despite similar scores on affinity and entitlement

299 subscales. Non-consumers in **segment 3** constitute the smallest group with 13.3% of

300 participants. Their average personal norm score (2.69), slightly below the scale's neutral point,

301 indicated a relatively moderate moral opposition to horse meat consumption. This segment is

302 clearly distinct from the other three segments in the relationship to meat. It showed the lowest

303 frequency of meat consumption (1.91) and the lowest psychological attachment to meat in

304 general (2.71). **Segment 4** was the second largest group with 34.2% of the participants. With

305 the lowest mean score on personal norm (1.79), these non-consumers expressed an obvious

306 moral opposition to hippophagy, stronger than those in Segment 3. At the same time, their

307 frequency of meat consumption (3.44) was similar to that of Segment 2, while mean meat

308 attachment scores (3.34) were above the neutral point as for Segments 1 and 2.

309 Based on these first elements, the 4 segments were named as follows. "Enthusiast" for

310 segment 1, consisting of the largest meat consumers, who morally accept and actually

311 consume horse meat. ***"Potential"*** *for the* second segment, which is composed of consistent

312 meat consumers who morally accept the consumption of horse meat but do not actually eat it.

313 ***"Distant"*** *for* segment 3, which includes the lowest meat consumers, who are neither for nor

314 against the consumption of horse meat but do not consume it . Finally, segment 4, composed

315 of consistent meat consumers who are morally opposed to horse meat and do not consume it,

316 has been named ***"Aversive"***.

317

318 3.3 Factors related to horse meat acceptance

319 Means of the factors related to horse meat acceptance are presented in Table 3. In addition,

320 Appendix 1 and 2 provides the distribution of the answers to knowledge questions for the

321   overall sample and Figure 1 and Appendix 3 illustrate the average ratings of each attitudinal

322   attribute across segments.

3.3.1 Disgust

Disgust towards horse meat significantly varied among segments (F=140.86; p<.001). Both *Enthusiast* (1.30) and *Potential* (1.97) showed a rather clear absence of disgust towards horse meat. Although less marked, with an average rating just below the neutral point 3, *Distant* tended to express low disgust (2.76). Only the *Aversive* segment recorded a mean score slightly above the neutral point (3.20) revealing a rather moderate form of disgust.

3.3.2 Knowledge

On 7 of the 9 knowledge questions, most participants answered "don't know" or gave an incorrect answer (see appendix 1). Although individuals know the color of horse meat (Q.6), nutritional properties (Q.3, 7 and 8), purchasing and consumption modalities (Q.1, 2, 4), environmental benefits (Q.9), as well as the origin of the meat (Q.9) are broadly unknown. This translated into a relatively low mean knowledge score (3.99) among the whole sample (Table 4). Nevertheless, compared to the other three groups, a significantly higher number of correct answers among the *Enthusiast* segment is found (F = 20.12; p<.001). This suggests that the lack of knowledge is a little less marked among consumers who are familiar with horse meat products.

3.3.3 Attitude

Respondent attitude towards horse meat was assessed through consumer perception on 8 horse meat attributes. First, the average score of all attributes (table 4) differs significantly between some of the groups (F=43.36, p<.001). *Enthusiast* garnered clear overall positive scores, *Potential* showed a slightly positive rating, while *Distant* and *Aversive* were similarly positioned on the neutral point of the scale. This means that, overall, the respondents tended to have a fairly positive or neutral attitude towards horse meat. However, significant differences in the evaluation of each attribute and between segments are noted (Fig 1.).

347347

Figure 1. Attitude towards horse meat on 7-point semantic differential scale (from -3 to +3)

350 For all segments, "animal friendly" recorded the lowest score, indicating a shared concern for

351 horse welfare and breeding conditions. Besides a negative attitude on the animal welfare

352 attribute, *Distant* and *Aversive* also assessed negatively on the "trust" attribute. For

353 *Enthusiast*, the highest rating was for "taste". It is also the attribute that illustrates the biggest

354 difference between *Enthusiast* and the other groups, and the lowest attribute for *Potential*.

355 This emphasizes that current consumers of horse meat appreciate its taste and poses the

356 hypothesis that those in the *Potential* segment may change their opinion of the taste of horse

357 meat if they were to try it. To develop this question further, we analyzed the attribute 'taste'

358 within the *Potential* group, differentiating individuals who have never eaten horse meat from

359 those who have already tried it. The mean comparison test revealed that within the *Potential*

360 group, those who have tasted horse meat at least once in their life tend to have a more

361 favorable evaluation of the taste attribute (.761) than individuals who have never tasted it

362 (.032) (t=-3.038; p<.005).

363 For *Potential* and *Distant*, the highest attribute is 'quality' (it is the second highest for

364 *Enthusiast* and *Aversive*). 'Healthy' is the highest attribute for *Aversive* and is also well

365 scored (second or third) for the other groups. This illustrates that, despite a lack of precise

366 knowledge of horse meat properties, its qualities and nutritional attributes are reasonably

367 recognized among all groups.

368 3.3.4   Social norm and purchase facility

369 Social norm and purchase facility have been analyzed to assess to what extent external factors

370 could favor or impede the acceptance and consumption of horse meat, and whether it differs

371 among the four profiles.

372 Regarding social norm, none of the segments stated a high degree of peer pressure against

373 horse meat consumption. *Distant* (3.00) and *Aversive* (2.87) scored close to the neutral point

374 meaning relatively weak peer pressure surrounding horse meat consumption. *Enthusiast* and

375 *Potential* reported higher mean values above the threshold 3 (F=29.98, p<.001). For

376 *Enthusiast* (4.05), social norm was clearly perceived as supporting horse meat consumption,

377 while *Potential* (3.64) seemed to feel a more moderate supportive peer pressure.

378 In terms of purchase facility it appears that all segments expressed difficulty in finding outlets

379 for horse meat, with more widely expressed barriers among *Enthusiast*, *Potential,* and *Distant*

380 than among *Aversive* (F=4.23, p<.001). This clearly reflects the limited supply of horse meat

381 products on the common market place. This result is in line with previous research that

382 showed the lack of visibility and availability of horse meat as a main reason for non-

383 consumption (Lamy *et al.*, 2020; Lamy *et al.*, 2022).

384 3.3.5 Differences in motivations between the segments

385 Consumption intention within the next 6 months has been assessed to distinguish whether

386 motivations to eat horse meat vary among people according to different contexts.

387 Unsurprisingly, the average intention to eat horse meat differs significantly between the

388 segments (F=121.21, <.001). We consistently found higher intention for *Enthusiast*, weak

389 intention among *Potential* and no stated intention at all for *Distant* and *Aversive*. More

390 interestingly, we observed differences according to the context. First, for all segments,

391 canteens appeared to be the less motivating environment. For *Enthusiast*, home appeared to

392 be the most favorable setting (4.12), followed by restaurants (3.74) and peers' homes (3.58).

393 In contrast, for *Potential*, intention to eat at home was weak (2.18) but scored slightly higher

394 in a relative's home (2.94) or restaurant (2.64). These results suggest that out-of-home

395 situations could be a conducive environment for persuading certain non-consumers to

396 experience and taste horse meat products.

397

398 3.4 Sociodemographic profile of the segments

3993   Table 4 presents the sociodemographic characteristics of the segments.
9
9

4004
0
0

401   **Table 4. Sociodemographic characteristics of the segments**

402 402

403   There were no significant age differences across the segments. However, as compared to the

404   distribution in the total sample, there were significantly more men among *Enthusiast* and

405   *Potential,* and significantly more women in *Distant* and *Aversive* clusters. In addition, we

406   observed that among *Potential* the proportion of individuals without children in their

407   household is significantly higher than the distribution of the sample, unlike the *Aversive* group

408   that has a higher proportion of households with children than the overall sample. In terms of

409   education, *Enthusiast* shared a lower level of tertiary education (post-secondary and higher)

410   compared to other segments as well as a lower proportion of students and a higher proportion

411   of self-employed and business owners. These results are in line with previous research that

412   studied French horse meat eaters' profiles and chiefly defined them as old men living in the

413 4   North of France (Lamy *et al.*, 2020).
1
3

414 4
1
4

415   4   Discussion and conclusion

416   This study provides insights about horse meat consumption in France. In particular, we

417   investigated whether consumers and non-consumers of this particular meat can be segmented

418   based on their personal norms, attitude, motivations and behavior and on which aspects these

419   segments differ. Our results have numerous implications for actors in the equine industry,

420   retailers, marketers and researchers.

421   Among the sample, a significant proportion of individuals had already tasted horse meat, at

422   least once in their lives, but only a minority includes this particular meat in their diet, and then

423   only occasionally. This result is consistent with national data, which indicate that the

424   consumption of horse meat in 2021 concerns approximately 7% of French households and

425   represents 0.1% of meat purchases (Drapeau, 2022).

426   Among horse meat consumers, a vast majority favor horse butcher's shops and traditional

427   butcher's shops for their supplies. However, to date, there are less than 750 specialized

428   butcher shops in France and only 3.7% of traditional butchers offer horse meat (Lizet, 2010).

429   It is therefore not surprising that individuals express difficulties in finding outlets for this

430   meat. The weak availability is a major obstacle for actual consumers that are limited in their

431   ability to purchase horse meat products, and also for non-consumers who, in the absence of a

432   visible offer, do not consider this meat when shopping. Developing alternative distribution

433   channels such as online sales or direct purchase from producers could favorably meet the

434   needs of current consumers. Stimulating demand is also crucial to maintaining and supporting

435   the horse meat market. Our results highlight a lack of knowledge about the horse meat

436   industry and lower scores on attitudinal attributes such as trust and animal welfare. A first

437   lever of action would therefore be to develop communication campaigns to inform about the

438   benefits of this meat especially in terms of environment, breeding conditions and nutritional

439   properties. However, by identifying 4 distinct profiles, our analysis shows that targeted

440   strategies must be developed according to the individuals and their relationship with both

441   meat in general and with horse meat.

442   *Aversive* and *Distant* are characterized by low acceptance of horse meat and thus appear as

443   non-priority targets. *Aversive* are meat lovers, but they tend to consider horse meat as a

444   separate meat category. For *Aversive*, hippophagy is opposed to their moral values and is

445   associated with an increased feeling of disgust compared to the other groups. These results are

446   consistent with traditional approaches to moral reasoning and emotion which claim that

447   conceptualizing meat eating as immoral creates an opportunity and an incentive to view meat

448   as disgusting (Rozin et al., 1997). It seems difficult to overcome this psychological barrier

449   even by presenting horse meat as a more sustainable option to beef or by emphasizing good

450   farming conditions. For the *Aversive* segment the aim is therefore to avoid hostile reactions

451   that could damage the image of the product. Similarly, *Distant* is not a promising segment.

452   The profile of these respondents suggests that horse meat is part of an overall more distant

453   attachment with meat in general. For this group, it can be assumed that the promotion of other

454   sources of protein such as plant-based foods would strike more of a chord than the promotion

455   of a meat with a low carbon impact.

456   *Enthusiast* and *Potential* are the two priority segments for the development of the horse meat

457   market. For *Enthusiast*, who are already consumers, their level of knowledge about the

458   product and their positive attitude towards it suggest that a communication strategy alone may

459   not be sufficient. For these individuals, the main obstacle is the characteristics of the offer and

460   more precisely its accessibility. Promoting the presence and visibility of the product in

461   distribution channels is a priority in order to increase consumption opportunities.

462   The *Potential* segment does not eat horse meat but is not morally opposed to hippophagy.

463   Interestingly, among this group, those who have already consumed this meat at least once

464   tend to evaluate its taste more favorably. This supports the idea of increasing the frequency of

465   horse meat exposure and experimental tasting. In the light of the consumption intentions

466   stated by this group, the context of commercial catering appears to be a privileged space to

467   incite the (re)discovery of this product. In a very competitive catering market, offering horse

468   meat can be an element of differentiation capable of arousing the curiosity of potential

469   consumers while meeting the expectations of current horse meat lovers. For actors of the

470   horse meat sector, this implies a Business to Business strategy addressed to catering

471   professionals, with the main target being brands positioned on meat such as steakhouses.

472   In order to avoid possible controversies and to encourage the choice of the product within the

473   menu, it would be interesting to test the effects of different information content (origin of the

474   product and rearing conditions, environmental benefits, nutritional and organoleptic qualities)

475   and distribution methods (information delivered by the waiter versus posted on the menu) on

476   the acceptance of the product and the intention to consume it in the restaurant. In addition,

477   insofar as the restaurant sector seems to be a promising distribution channel, it would be

478 advisable to conduct investigations among chefs and cooks in order to take into account their

479 motivations and barriers with respect to the product.

480 This work sheds light on the different profiles of consumers and non-consumers of horse

481 meat. However, the size of the sample, its low representativeness of the French population,

482 and the over-representation of women, younger people and individuals from higher

483 professions, suggest caution in generalizing the results obtained. Indeed, since these three

484 profiles are traditionally associated with lower horse meat consumption (Lamy *et al.*, 2020),

485 it is reasonable to believe that our results could underestimate the number of *Enthusiasts* and

486 *Potentials*. Therefore, a new data collection from a representative sample of the French

487 population would be useful.

488 Nevertheless, the focus on horse meat offers an original perspective for several reasons.

489 Firstly, it makes it possible to analyze the acceptance of an alternative source of protein that

490 has environmental and health benefits. Secondly, horse meat is an ambivalent food that for the

491 most part remains unexamined and is associated with strong emotional and moral issues. It is

492 consequently an extreme case that can shed light on common issues for other meat: alternative

493 new meat such as kangaroos or ostriches, meat from production animals that are also pets

494 (e.g., rabbits), meat from animals that arouse emotional attachment (e.g.,lamb) and

495 uncommon meat (e.g, snails, frogs). More generally, in the current trend in western societies

496 of controversy surrounding animal welfare and meat consumption, these results provide

497 insight into the future for meat in general. In a perspective of sustainable diet, the

498 diversification of protein sources is a major challenge. This will only be possible by adapting

499 the products on offer to the various population targets, improving product availability and

500 visibility, and by adapting communication, which highlights the benefits of these products in

501   2

502

terms
of
health,
environ
ment,
and
animal
welfare
.

503   **References**

504

505   Balji, Y., Knicky, M., & Zamaratskaia, G. (2020). Perspectives and safety of horsemeat

506   consumption. *International Journal of Food Science & Technology*, *55*(3), 942‑952.

507   https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.14390

508   Banović, M., Fontes, M. A., Barreira, M. M., & Grunert, K. G. (2012). Impact of Product

509   Familiarity on Beef Quality Perception : IMPACT OF PRODUCT FAMILIARITY ON

510   BEEF   QUALITY   PERCEPTION.   *Agribusiness*,   *28*(2),   157‑172.

511   https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21290

512   Banović, M., Grunert, K. G., Barreira, M. M., & Fontes, M. A. (2009). Beef quality perception

513   at the point of purchase : A study from Portugal. *Food Quality and Preference*, *20*(4),

514   335‑342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2009.02.009

515   Belaunzaran, X., Bessa, R. J. B., Lavín, P., Mantecón, A. R., Kramer, J. K. G., & Aldai, N.

516   (2015). Horse-meat for human consumption—Current research and future

517   opportunities.   *Meat   Science*,   *108*,   74‑81.

518   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2015.05.006

519   Belaunzaran, X., Lavín, P., Barron, L. J. R., Mantecón, A. R., Kramer, J. K. G., & Aldai, N.

520   (2017). An assessment of the fatty acid composition of horse-meat available at the retail

521   level   in   northern   Spain.   *Meat   Science*,   *124*,   39‑47.

522   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2016.10.014

523   Benningstad, N. C. G., & Kunst, J. R. (2020). Dissociating meat from its animal origins : A

524   systematic   literature   review.   *Appetite*,   *147*,   104554.

525   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104554

526   Bigot, G., Vial, C., Fleurance, G., Heydemann, P., & Palazoni, R. (2018). Productions et

527   activités équines en France : Quelles contributions à la durabilité de l'agriculture? *INRA*

528   *Productions Animales*, *31*(1), 37‑50.

529 Cazes-Valette, G. (2008). *Les déterminants du rapport à la viande chez le mangeur français*

530 *contemporain*   [These   de   doctorat,   Paris,   EHESS].

531 https://www.theses.fr/2008EHES0315

532 Circus, V. E., & Robison, R. (2019). Exploring perceptions of sustainable proteins and meat

533 attachment. *British Food Journal*, *121*(2), 533‑545. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-

534 2018-0025

535 Digard, J.-P. (2012). Hippophagie. In J.-P. Poulain (Éd.), *Dictionnaire des cultures*

536 *alimentaires* (Presses Universitaires de France, p. 689‑695). Presses Universitaires de

537 France.

538 Dowsett, E., Semmler, C., Bray, H., Ankeny, R. A., & Chur-Hansen, A. (2018). Neutralising

539 the meat paradox : Cognitive dissonance, gender, and eating animals. *Appetite*, *123*,

540 280‑288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.01.005

541 Drapeau, C. (2022). *Les chiffres sur la viande chevaline* (p. 5). Institut français du cheval et de

542 l'équitation,.

543 Font-i-Furnols, M., & Guerrero, L. (2014). Consumer preference, behavior and perception

544 about meat and meat products : An overview. *Meat Science*, *98*(3), Article 3.

545 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.06.025

546 FranceAgriMer. (2015). *La production de viande chevaline des années 50 à aujourd'hui-2015*.

547 https://www.franceagrimer.fr/fam/content/download/36805/document/SYN-VRO-20-

548 La%20production%20de%20viande%20chevaline%20des%20ann%C3%A9es%2050

549 %20%C3%A0%20aujourd%27hui-2015.pdf?version=5

550 Franz, R., Soliva, C. R., Kreuzer, M., Steuer, P., Hummel, J., & Clauss, M. (2010). Methane

551 production in relation to body mass of ruminants and equids. *Evolutionary Ecology*

552 *Research*, *12*(6), 727‑738. Scopus.

553   Graça, J., Calheiros, M. M., & Oliveira, A. (2015). Attached to meat? (Un)Willingness and

554   intentions to adopt a more plant-based diet. *Appetite*, *95*, 113‑125.

555   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.06.024

556   IFCE. (2021). *Annuaire ECUS 2021 : Bilan statistique de la filière équine française, données*

557   *2020* (p. 104). Institut français du cheval et de l'équitation,.

558   https://equipedia.ifce.fr/fileadmin/bibliotheque/6.Statistiques/6.1.Ecus-

559   depliant/ECUS-2021-WEB.pdf

560   Insausti, K., Beldarrain, L. R., Lavín, M. P., Aldai, N., Mantecón, Á. R., Sáez, J. L., & Canals,

561   R. M. (2021). Horse meat production in northern Spain : Ecosystem services and

562   sustainability in High Nature Value farmland. *Animal Frontiers*, *11*(2), 47‑54.

563   https://doi.org/10.1093/af/vfab003

564   Jaskari, M.-M., Leipämaa-Leskinen, H., & Syrjälä, H. (2015). Revealing the paradoxes of

565   horsemeat – The challenges of marketing horsemeat in Finland. *Nordic Journal of*

566   *Business*, *64*(2), 17.

567   Jastrzębska, E., Daszkiewicz, T., Górecka-Bruzda, A., & Feliś, D. (2019). Current situation and

568   prospects for the horse meat market in Poland and the world. *Medycyna Weterynaryjna*,

569   *75*(02), 6203‑2019. https://doi.org/10.21521/mw.6203

570   Jez, C., Coudurier, B., Cressent, M., & Méa, F. (2013). Factors driving change in the French

571   horse industry to 2030. *Advances in Animal Biosciences*, *4*, 66‑105.

572   https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040470013000368

573   Köster, E. P. (2009a). Diversity in the determinants of food choice : A psychological

574   perspective. *Food Quality and Preference*, *20*(2), Article 2.

575   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2007.11.002

576   Köster, E. P. (2009b). Diversity in the determinants of food choice : A psychological

577   perspective. *Food Quality and Preference*, *20*(2), Article 2.

578   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2007.11.002

579   Lamy, A., Costa, S., Lanauze, G. S. de, Vial, C., & Sirieix, L. (2022). When the product was

580   an animal. The role of representations and affective ties to the animal in relationships

581   with meat products and their consumption. *Decisions Marketing*, *107*(3), 269‑289.

582   Lamy, A., & Vial-Pion, C. (2020). *Histoire de la consommation de viande chevaline* (p. 7)

583   [Note thématique]. IFCE. https://equipedia.ifce.fr/economie-et-filiere/culture-et-

584   patrimoine/histoire-de-la-consommation-de-viande-chevaline.html

585   Lentz, G., Connelly, S., Mirosa, M., & Jowett, T. (2018). Gauging attitudes and behaviours :

586   Meat consumption and potential reduction. *Appetite*, *127*, 230‑241.

587   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.04.015

588   Leteux, S. (2005). L'hippophagie en France : La difficile acceptation d'une viande honteuse

589   (archives). *Terrains & travaux*, *n° 9*(2), 143. https://doi.org/10.3917/tt.009.0143

590   Lin-Schilstra, L., & Fischer, A. R. H. (2020). Consumer Moral Dilemma in the Choice of

591   Animal-Friendly Meat Products. *Sustainability*, *12*(12), Article 12.

592   https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124844

593   Lizet, B. (2010). Le cheval français en morceaux. Statut de l'animal, statut de sa viande.

594   *Anthropozoologica*, *45*(1), 137‑148. https://doi.org/10.5252/az2010n1a9

595   Lorenzo, J. M., Sarriés, M. V., Tateo, A., Polidori, P., Franco, D., & Lanza, M. (2014). Carcass

596   characteristics, meat quality and nutritional value of horsemeat : A review. *Meat*

597   *Science*, *96*(4), 1478‑1488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2013.12.006

598   Mooi, E., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). *A Concise Guide to Market Research*. Springer Berlin

599   Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12541-6

600   Moss, A. R., Jouany, J.-P., & Newbold, J. (2000). Methane production by ruminants : Its

601   contribution to global warming. *Animal Research*, *49*(3), 231‑253. Scopus.

602   https://doi.org/10.1051/animres:2000119

603   Oh, W. Y., Lee, J. W., Lee, C. E., Ko, M. S., & Jeong, J. H. (2009). Analysis of consumers'

604   preferences and behavior with regard to horse meat using a structured survey

605   questionnaire : ANALYSIS OF CONSUMERS' PREFERENCES AND BEHAVIOR

606   ON HORSE MEAT. *Animal Science Journal*, *80*(6), Article 6.

607   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-0929.2009.00672.x

608 Poławska, E., Cooper, R. G., Jóźwik, A., & Pomianowski, J. (2013). Meat from alternative

609   species – nutritive and dietetic value, and its benefit for human health – a review. *CyTA*

610   *- Journal of Food*, *11*(1), 37‑42. https://doi.org/10.1080/19476337.2012.680916

611 Popoola, I. O., Anders, S., Feuereisen, M. M., Savarese, M., & Wismer, W. V. (2021a). Free

612   word association perceptions of red meats; beef is 'yummy', bison is 'lean game meat',

613   horse is 'off limits'. *Food Research International*, *148*, 110608.

614   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2021.110608

615 Popoola, I. O., Anders, S., Feuereisen, M. M., Savarese, M., & Wismer, W. V. (2021b). Free

616   word association perceptions of red meats; beef is 'yummy', bison is 'lean game meat',

617   horse is 'off limits'. *Food Research International*, *148*, 110608.

618   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2021.110608

619 Popoola, I. O., Bruce, H. L., McMullen, L. M., & Wismer, W. V. (2019). Consumer Sensory

620   Comparisons Among Beef, Horse, Elk, and Bison Using Preferred Attributes Elicitation

621   and Check-All-That-Apply Methods. *Journal of Food Science*, *84*(10), Article 10.

622   https://doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.14780

623 Popoola, I. O., Soladoye, P. O., Gaudette, N. J., & Wismer, W. V. (2020). A Review of Sensory

624   and Consumer-related Factors Influencing the Acceptance of Red Meats from

625   Alternative Animal Species. *Food Reviews International*, 1‑20.

626   https://doi.org/10.1080/87559129.2020.1860084

627 Rødbotten, M., Kubberød, E., Lea, P., & Ueland, Ø. (2004). A sensory map of the meat

628   universe. Sensory profile of meat from 15 species. *Meat Science*, *68*(1), 137‑144.

629   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.02.016

630   Rousseeuw, P. J. (1987). Silhouettes : A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of

631   cluster analysis. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, *20*, 53‑65.

632   https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0427(87)90125-7

633   Rozin, P., & Fallon, A. (1980). The psychological categorization of foods and non-foods : A

634   preliminary taxonomy of food rejections. *Appetite*, *1*(3), 193‑201.

635   https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6663(80)80027-4

636   Rozin, P., Markwith, M., & Stoess, C. (1997). Moralization and Becoming a Vegetarian : The

637   Transformation of Preferences Into Values and the Recruitment of Disgust.

638   *Psychological Science*, *8*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

639   9280.1997.tb00685.x

640   Ruby, M. B., & Heine, S. J. (2011). Meat, morals, and masculinity. *Appetite*, *56*(2), 447‑450.

641   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2011.01.018

642   Rzekęć, A., Vial, C., & Bigot, G. (2020). Green Assets of Equines in the European Context of

643   the Ecological Transition of Agriculture. *Animals*, *10*(1), Article 1.

644   https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10010106

645   Verbeke, W., Marcu, A., Rutsaert, P., Gaspar, R., Seibt, B., Fletcher, D., & Barnett, J. (2015).

646   'Would you eat cultured meat?' : Consumers' reactions and attitude formation in

647   Belgium, Portugal and the United Kingdom. *Meat Science*, *102*, 49‑58.

648   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.11.013

649   Verbeke, W., Sans, P., & Van Loo, E. J. (2015). Challenges and prospects for consumer

650   acceptance of cultured meat. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, *14*(2), 285‑294.

651   https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(14)60884-4

652   Verbeke, W., & Vackier, I. (2004). Profile and effects of consumer involvement in fresh meat.

653   *Meat Science*, *67*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2003.09.017

654   Verbeke, W., & Viaene, J. (1999). Beliefs, attitude and behaviour towards fresh meat

655   consumption in Belgium : Empirical evidence from a consumer survey. *Food Quality*

656   *and Preference*, *10*(6), 437‑445. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0950-3293(99)00031-2

657   Westhoek, H., Lesschen, J. P., Rood, T., Wagner, S., De Marco, A., Murphy-Bokern, D., Leip,

658   A., van Grinsven, H., Sutton, M. A., & Oenema, O. (2014). Food choices, health and

659   environment : Effects of cutting Europe's meat and dairy intake. *Global Environmental*

660   *Change*, *26*, 196‑205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.02.004

661   Whiting, T. L. (2007). The United States' prohibition of horsemeat for human consumption : Is

662   this a good law? *The Canadian Veterinary Journal*, *48*(11), Article 11.

663   Wiart, L., Özçağlar-Toulouse, N., & Shaw, D. (2022). Maintaining market legitimacy : A

664   discursive-hegemonic perspective on meat. *Journal of Business Research*, *144*,

665   391‑402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.02.024

666   Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., Garnett, T.,

667   Tilman, D., DeClerck, F., Wood, A., Jonell, M., Clark, M., Gordon, L. J., Fanzo, J.,

668   Hawkes, C., Zurayk, R., Rivera, J. A., Vries, W. D., Sibanda, L. M., … Murray, C. J.

669   L. (2019). Food in the Anthropocene : The EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets

670   from   sustainable   food   systems.   *The   Lancet*,   *393*(10170),   447‑492.

671   https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4

672

673

Table 1. Characteristics of the valid sample (% of respondents, n=482)

Gender		
	Male	29.4
	Female	70.5
	Gender diverse	0.1
Age		
	18-25 years	19.7
	26-35 years	27.2
	36-45 Years	17.6
	46-55 years	17.2
	56-64 years	11.0
	>65 years	7.3
	Mean	40.0
	(S.D)	(15.1)
Education		
	Upper secondary and lower	13.7
	Post-secondary and higher	86.3
Employment status		
	Student	16.2
	Self-employed and business owner	5.4
	Employed	22.0
	Executive and higher profession	46.7
	Retired	7.9
	Unemployed	1.9
Frequency of meat consumption		
	Less than once a month	1.5
	More than once a month	12.4
	More than once a week	41.9
	Daily	44.2
Frequency of horse meat consumption		
	Less than once a month	14.2
	More than once a month	1.0
	More than once a week	1.0
	Never	83.8
	Never but already tasted	*54.0*
	During childhood	*77.0*
	During adulthood	*23.0*

677 **Table 2. Description and characterization of the Segments (S) based on the classification variables and**

678 **meat attachment scales**

	Sample		S.1 Enthusiast		S.2 Potential		S.3 Distant		S.4 Aversive			
Sample size (%)	482	(100)	78	(16.2)	175	(36.3)	64	(13.3)	165	(34.2)	F-Value	p-Value
Number of horse meat consumers	78		78		0		0		0			
	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E		
Personal norm[1]	3.13	1.29	4.38 a	0.70	4.00 b	0.64	2.69 c	1.06	1.79 d	0.56	386.66	<.001
Meat consumption[2]	3.29	0.74	3.64 a	0.6	3.49 b	0.5	1.91 c	0.29	3.44 b	0.5	193.49	<.001
Meat attachment [1]	3.5	0.85	3.96 a	0.85	3.74 b	0.68	2.70 d	0.73	3.33 c	0.82	40.35	<.001
Hedonism	*3.65*	*1.01*	*4.19 a*	*0.85*	*3.88 b*	*0.84*	*2.69 d*	*0.93*	*3.54 c*	*0.98*	*37.1*	*<.001*
Affinity	*4.02*	*0.91*	*4.42 a*	*0.76*	*4.33 a*	*0.68*	*3.39 c*	*1.02*	*3.74 b*	*0.9*	*32.59*	*<.001*
Entitlement	*3.35*	*1.12*	*3.70 a*	*1.2*	*3.55 a*	*0.99*	*2.75 c*	*1.09*	*3.20 b*	*1.1*	*12.3*	*<.001*
Dependence	*2.94*	*1.05*	*3.43 a*	*1.1*	*3.17 b*	*0.93*	*2.02 d*	*0.81*	*2.83 c*	*0.98*	*30.33*	*<.001*

679 [1] 5-point Likert scale (from 1 to 5) ; [2] 5-point frequency scale (from 0 'never' to 4 'every day') ; a; b; c, d, Scores in one row

680 with a different superscript are significantly different at p < 0:05 (one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey multiple comparison

681 test).

682

683 **Table3. Factors related to horse meat acceptance**

	Sample		Enthusiast		Potential		Distant		Aversive		F-Value	p-Value
	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E		
Disgust [1]	2.39	1.03	1.30 d	0.46	1.97 c	0.76	2.76 b	1.00	3.20 a	0.75	140.86	<.001
Knowledge [2]	3.99	2.34	5.68 a	2.01	3.96 b	2.25	3.23 c	1.87	3.52 bc	2.35	20.12	<.001
Attitude [3]	0.48	1.10	1.42 a	1.17	0.67 b	0.88	-0.01 c	1.17	0.03 c	0.90	43.36	<.001
Social norm[1]	3.36	1.05	4.05 a	0.12	3.64 b	0.08	3.00 c	0.13	2.87 c	0.08	29.98	<.001
Purchase facility[1]	3.82	0.96	4.04 a	0.81	3.89 a	0.90	3.94 a	0.82	3.60 b	1.08	4.23	0.001
Intention [1]	2.10	1.22	3.52 a	1.00	2.45 b	1.20	1.57 c	0.84	1.27 d	0.56	121.21	<.001
Home	2.05	1.47	4.12 a	1.29	2.18 b	1.35	1.40 c	0.91	1.20 c	0.63	134.69	<.001
Relatives, Friends and family	2.41	1.50	3.58 a	1.33	2.94 b	1.46	2.03 c	1.36	1.43 d	0.90	66.25	<.001
Restaurant	2.22	1.44	3.74 a	1.30	2.64 b	1.41	1.67 c	1.13	1.27 d	0.66	94.77	<.001
Canteen	1.57	1.06	2.27 a	1.43	1.86 b	1.23	1.12 c	0.38	1.10 c	0.41	34.19	<.001

684 [1] 5-point Likert scale (from 1 to 5) ; [2] average number of correct responses to 9 knowledge questions; [3] average score derived

685 from the 8 average attributes rated on 7-point semantic differential scale (from -3 to +3) a; b; c, d, Scores in one row with a

686 different superscript are significantly different at p < 0:05 (one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey multiple comparison test).

687

**Figure 1. Attitude towards horse meat on 7-point semantic differential scale (from -3 to +3)**

690

691 **Table 4. Sociodemographic characteristics of the segments**

	Sample	Enthusiast	Potential	Distant	Aversive	F-Value[1] /χ²	p-Value
Age (Mean) [1]	40.1	42.64 a	40.82 ab	37.28 b	39.36 ab	1.73	.16
Gender (%)						37.35	<.001
Female	70.8	**50.0***	**64.0***	**82.3***	**83.6***		
Male	29.2	**50.0***	**36.0***	**17.7***	**16.4***		
Presence of children in the household (%)						9.245	.026
NO	68	62.8	73.7	76.6	**61.2***		
YES	31	37.2	**26.3***	23.4	**38.8***		
Education (%)						10.97	.012
Upper secondary and lower	13.7	**24.4***	10.9	17.2	10.3		
Post-secondary and higher	86.3	**75.6***	89.1	82.8	89.7		
Employment status (%)						28.88	.017
Student	16.2	**9.0***	18.3	25.0	13.9		
Self-employed and business owner	5.4	**11.5***	5.1	3.1	3.6		
Employed	22.0	23.1	**15.4***	18.8	**29.7***		
Executive and higher profession	46.7	44.9	49.7	43.8	45.5		
Retired	7.9	10.3	10.3	7.8	**4.2***		
Unemployed	1.9	1.3	1.1	1.6	3.0		

[1]F-value for the age (average), χ^2 for other tests**Appendix 1** Knowledge questionnaire

Questions	Correct answer
Q1.Horse meat can be eaten raw	TRUE
Q2.Horse meat is allowed in traditional restaurants	TRUE
Q3.Horse meat is more fatty than beef	FALSE
Q4.Horse meat is only sold in horse butcher shops	FALSE
Q5.Horse meat consumed in France is mostly of foreign origin	TRUE
Q6.Horse meat is a white meat	FALSE
Q7.Horse meat is less rich in iron than beef	FALSE
Q8.Horse meat contains more good fats than beef (more omega 3 and 6 and a better proportion of unsaturated fatty acids)	TRUE
Q9.A horse emits more greenhouse gases than a bovine	FALSE

693

694 **Appendix 2.** Proportion of correct, incorrect and "don't know" answers among the sample

695

696 **Appendix 3.** Attitude towards horse meat on 7-point semantic differential scale (from -3 to

697 +3)

	Sample		Enthusiast		Potential		Distant		Aversive		F-Value	p-Value
	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E	M	S.E		
Attitude	0.48	1.10	1.42 a	1.17	0.67 b	0.88	-0.01 c	1.11	0.03 c	0.91	43.36	<.001
Bad / Good quality	0.88	1.48	1.83 a	1.44	1.11 b	1.24	0.41 c	1.42	0.37 c	1.46	23.96	<.001
Bad / Good taste	0.55	1.70	2.05 a	1.52	0.50 b	1.55	0.19 bc	1.62	0.02 c	1.45	32.89	<.001
Unhealthy / Healthy	0.74	1.56	1.73 a	1.71	0.85 b	1.45	0.20 c	1.35	0.38 c	1.44	17.98	<.001
With / Without harmful substances	0.45	1.55	0.90 a	1.82	0.59 a	1.52	-0.02 b	1.40	0.26 b	1.43	5.50	0.001
Untrustworthy / Trustworthy	0.33	1.64	1.53 a	1.71	0.69 b	1.37	-0.16 c	1.57	-0.41 c	1.46	35.9	<.001
Difficult / Easy to cook	0.46	1.47	1.60 a	1.64	0.53 b	1.25	-0.09 c	1.39	0.05 c	1.30	26.79	<.001
Not animal friendly / Animal friendly	-0.02	1.53	0.54 a	1.60	0.38 a	1.32	-0.59 b	1.50	-0.49 b	1.52	16.97	<.001
Unsafe / Safe	0.47	1.52	1.19 a	1.55	0.72 b	1.43	0.00 c	1.63	0.04 c	1.36	14.98	<.001

698 a; b; c, d, Scores in one row with a different superscript are significantly different at p < 0:05 (one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey multiple

699 comparison test).

Author statement

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data available on request from the authors