

The Relationship between Parental Styles and Food Attitude of Children Towards Vegetarianism

Phani Tej Adidam (Corresponding Author)

Professor of Marketing and Entrepreneurship College of Business Administration University of Nebraska at Omaha
6708 Pine Street Omaha, NE 68182-0048
Email: padidam@unomaha.edu

Irene F. Shaker

Faculty of Business Administration and International Trade Misr International University KM 28 Cairo – Ismailia
Road Ahmed Orabi District, Cairo Egypt

Sherief Atef Ahmed Wahid El-Din

Faculty of Business Administration and International Trade Misr International University KM 28 Cairo – Ismailia
Road Ahmed Orabi District, Cairo Egypt

Article History

Received: 24 January, 2022


Revised: 13 March, 2022

Accepted: 28 March, 2022

Published: 3 April, 2022

Copyright © 2022 ARPG & Author

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International

 **CC BY: Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0**

Abstract

An oft-neglected area of research is the degree of compliance associated with different parental styles, regardless of the health concerns of the parents. This study examined 204 respondents, 102 children, and 102 parents, examining food attitudes and preferences of parents, alongside their parental styles and degree of compliance displayed by children. It was found that authoritative parenting is the most significantly correlated one with child compliance to vegetarian food preferences and behaviors of parents.

Keywords: Vegetarianism; Parental styles; Food attitude; Ethical eating; Food choice; Child compliance.

1. Introduction

Vegetarianism is an extraordinarily complex social, cultural, political, and environmental phenomena. The estimated number of vegetarians in the American population has risen to almost 4% in 2020 while in some demographics such as college students have been shown to be more likely to switch to a vegetarian diet where almost 6% of young adults reported following vegetarian dietary practices (Olfert *et al.*, 2020). It is also garnering a larger worldwide following and much bigger interest in recent times (Milichovsky and Mráček, 2020). There are several advantages of being a vegetarian as regards to health and general quality of life (Hargreaves *et al.*, 2021). There are different motivations that lead to the adoption of a vegetarian diet (Jab and Devine, 2000) such as ethical, religious, and ecological issues.

Scholars have arrived at a consensus that it is easier to become a vegetarian as a child (9 to 12 years) as opposed to being an adult (McEvoy and Woodside, 2015). However, children's diet patterns are increasingly influenced by fast food marketers, media characters, social media influencers, and friends (Jones and Kervin, 2011; Kotler *et al.*, 2012). The role of parents has not been researched much.

Thus, in this study, we explore whether parents can motivate children to adopt a vegetarian diet. If so, what parenting styles would most probably lead to success. We first provide a literature review about vegetarianism and parenting styles. Second, we develop research questions, followed by an empirical assessment of these questions. Finally, we arrive at conclusions and future research directions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Vegetarianism as a Social Phenomenon

Vegetarianism is viewed as an expression of reducing animalistic passions and tendencies, animal-friendliness, and female autonomy (Adams, 2018). This was supported by Kalof *et al.* (1999), who found that women in their study were twice as likely to be vegetarian as men. Vegetarians, among their many classifications were categorized into "joiners" which were usually members in groups and subscribers to spiritual beliefs that asserted vegetarianism, and "loners" whose vegetarianism was relatively divorced from other daily routines, and which had more individualistic vegetarian attitudes and behaviors (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992).

2.2. Types of Vegetarians

According to the American Council of Science and Health, there are eight different types of vegetarianism, outlined below (Boyle, 2011).

1. *Semi-vegetarians*: These are people who choose to eat vegetables, nuts, fruits, legumes, dairy, grains, poultry, seafood, and eggs. The one food item omitted from their diet is red meat: beef and pork to be precise.

2. *Pollo-vegetarians*: People who only omit red meat and seafood from their diets while retaining the ability to eat poultry, dairy, and eggs alongside all the vegetarian and vegetable-derived foods.
3. *Pesco-vegetarians*: People who eat seafood, eggs, and dairy alongside vegetarian and vegetable-derived foods, while eliminating poultry and red meat. These are also known as lacto-ovo-pesco vegetarians, who are notably found to be able to support growth rates that are well above normal (Nathan *et al.*, 1997).
4. *Ovo-lacto-vegetarians*: People who omit seafood, poultry, and red meat from their diets while still eating dairy products and eggs. These are more consistent with the stereotypical notions of vegetarianism. They also consume, obviously, vegetables, legumes, grains, nuts and fruits.
5. *Lacto-vegetarians*: People who omit seafood, eggs, poultry, and red meat. Their only animal-derived food item is dairy products. The rest of their diet relies on fruits, legumes, vegetables, grains, and nuts.
6. *Ovo-vegetarians*: People who consume eggs but omit poultry, seafood, red meat, and dairy products. They also consume vegetables and vegetable-derived food items.
7. *Vegans*: These people will eliminate all animal-derived food products from their diets, and may even go as far as eliminating the entirety of animal-derived products from other daily routines due to being associated with a more moralistic set of principles towards consuming animal-derived products (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992; McIlveen *et al.*, 1999).
8. *Fruitarianism*: The most stringent type of vegetarianism, fruitarianism is centered on the consumption of fruit only; vegetables and vegetable-derived food products are actually viewed to be unethical to consume.

2.3. Motivations for Vegetarianism

The motivations for vegetarianism and veganism are ubiquitous and highly varying. It can be morally mandated vegetarianism, vegetarianism for health reasons, for ecological reasons, and spiritual reasons (Fan *et al.*, 2019; Rosenfeld *et al.*, 2020). Veganism, as perhaps the strictest type of vegetarianism second only to fruitarianism, has gradations and levels to its stringency as some vegans can go as far as not using animal-tested cosmetics, honey, or food additives derived from animals while others limit their involvement to food items alone (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992; Boyle, 2011; McIlveen *et al.*, 1999). The social movement of vegetarianism extends and specifies the motivations behind being a vegetarian is that a vegetarian diet could also relieve world hunger be more environmentally sustainable and friendly (Kalof *et al.*, 1999).

Another classification of vegetarianism and its motivations, that includes the animal-related ones, is that of *Moral vs Health vegetarianism*. Moral vegetarians are those who stop eating meat and other animal-derived products for moral and ethical reasons. In the context of vegetarianism, these values tend to attach an “ought” to one’s food behavior and attitude; subjecting it to a normative structure of principles that deem certain food appealing and acceptable as opposed to “others” which are “disgusting,” “wrong,” or even morally reprehensible (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992; Chen and Pham, 2019; Rozin *et al.*, 1997). A particularly interesting insight found by Rozin and colleagues (1997; 1999) is that values can more effectively be transmitted in families than are preferences, hence increasing the likelihood that moral vegetarians are more likely to have intergenerational influence over their children than are health vegetarians (Rozin *et al.*, 1997) Health vegetarianism, on the other hand, is concerned with one being a vegetarian for medical conditions or for other health reasons; ones that do not have a moral bearing on their decision making or their value structure; these are also known as “compliant vegetarians” (Rozin *et al.*, 1997).

The conversion to vegetarianism or the “moralization” of vegetarianism, which is the process by which an individual or even a household or a culture develop moral judgements and sentiments towards objects or items that were formerly provoking a moral neutrality (Rozin *et al.*, 1997), has varying reasons, is related to idiosyncratic factors, and can often have reasons that reach back to childhood such as growing up next to animals or on a farm, moving out at an early age which disrupts parentally enforced foodways, and undergoing an intense emotional experience, or even kinship between what is eaten and oneself, and the idea of slaughter (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992; Cudworth, 2020; Kalof *et al.*, 1999). This moralization can, more simply, be defined as the process by which values are transformed into preferences, leading to a deep-seated conviction and, subsequently, behaviors that are in alignment with these values (Rozin *et al.*, 1997).

2.4. Nutritional Beliefs

Nutritional beliefs surrounding vegetarianism are as varied and diverse as the motivations surrounding it. Three themes were prominent in a landmark study of vegetarianism (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992). First, the anti-meat theme: which were people who viewed meat as over-rated in terms of nutrition, as well as potentially unhealthy and hazardous alongside being unsanitary. For vegetarians who are anti-meat, meat, as a word, is associated with dead flesh and bodies, or “chewing flesh”, “blood”. Beardsworth and Keil (1992). Second, the ‘pro-meat’ theme which is often less emphasized and pronounced than vegetarianism yet emphatic about the nutritional value of meat (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992). Lastly, the third theme is the ‘pro-vegetarian’ theme, which praises the value of a vegetarian diet for its own sake, rather than arguing for vegetarianism based on a rejection of meat (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992).

Nutritional disorders are widespread among children to the point of being an epidemic in some countries and while it is known that healthy nutrition for children is paramount, obesity is still rampant in children who are, because of it, more likely to develop health difficulties becoming of much older adults including hypertension, poor physical shape, and even atherosclerosis and fibrous plaques in blood vessels (Klesges *et al.*, 1991).

Children were more likely to consume foods that their parents ate, and meals that tasted and looked appealing (Kumar *et al.*, 2016; Marshall *et al.*, 1994). This can be attributed to both modeling (Christian *et al.*, 2013;

Hughner and Maher, 2006; Liu *et al.*, 2015; Yee *et al.*, 2017) and parental control of accessibility given the role they play as the most important gatekeepers in the household (Hewitt and Stephens, 2007; Hughner and Maher, 2006; Lagström *et al.*, 2001; Yee *et al.*, 2017). Parental control of accessibility is defined as “whether the foods are prepared, presented, and/or maintained in a form that enables or encourages children to eat them” (Yee *et al.*, 2017). This, hence, emphasizes the importance of taste and appearance, alongside food preparation activities. An example of such activities is that children were more likely to consume fruit and vegetables if the food items were cut up and well presented (Christian *et al.*, 2013).

Of those reducing their meat-eating behavior, higher socioeconomic groups were more likely to have health reasons, while those from lower groups reported eating less meat for financial reasons (Beardsworth and Keil, 1991; Marshall *et al.*, 1994). However, the most commonly reported reason for vegetarianism in the (Beardsworth and Keil, 1991) study was a moral one pertaining to ethical eating. Reinforcing Adams (2018) claim, women from the 16-24 years of age were more likely to eat less meat or abstain from it completely, usually for health, moral, and financial reasons (Beardsworth and Keil, 1991).

Meat is full of saturated fat, and it is known to be unhealthy due to high fat and cholesterol content which may contribute to an increase in coronary heart disease (CHD) (Chen, 2020; Kalof *et al.*, 1999; Lagström *et al.*, 2001; Marshall *et al.*, 1994). Consuming vegetables and fruits have always been known to be healthy, and it reached soaring heights in the years before 1994 (Marshall *et al.*, 1994). It was widely believed in earlier research that food attitudes transpired from individual experience, family, social environmental factors, and the influences of the media (Eldridge and Murcott, 2000; Marshall *et al.*, 1994; Ward, 1974). That was later developed to include social-psychological factors, norms, attitudes, beliefs, and values (Kalof *et al.*, 1999; Sommer, 2013). In a study of the inclination to change foodways and food attitudes, 71% of the respondents claimed that their current dietary practices were unlikely to change and that they adequately met their nutritional needs (Marshall *et al.*, 1994). Thus, it becomes critical for parents to influence children when they are ideally in the 9 to 12 years old range (McEvoy and Woodside, 2015).

2.5. Parental “Influence”

The questions surrounding parental influence have been rampant due to the vagueness and ambiguity of the term. For instance, questions like whether children like a certain food and whether this matters in their choice of food items are prominent ones. Another question pertains to whether it is more important for children to “prefer” an item or to like its taste? And when, if ever, does peer pressure take the place of parental influence and guidance? (Eldridge and Murcott, 2000). It was noted by Parletta *et al.* (2012) and colleagues that peers are increasingly influential on dietary patterns, especially in adolescent years. Another question is whether the autonomy given by the parent to the child would actually increase the likelihood of compliance due to the intrinsically motivational nature of autonomy (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Moreover, encouragement was correlated positively with children’s weight and their compliance due to notion that it may reinforce needs of relatedness, which are also intrinsically motivating (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Klesges *et al.*, 1991). Parental involvement in food selection was also associated with a decreased likelihood of a child choosing low-nutritional value food (Klesges *et al.*, 1991).

The social influences concerning vegetarianism are diverse. They extend from the immediate family to colleagues, friends, and extends way beyond that to social influencers (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992). When a family member expresses interest in becoming a vegetarian or a vegan, they may be presented with support and sympathy and on the other extreme of the spectrum – bewilderment, criticism, or even outright, blatant hostility. It could, when presented by a child, be accepted and supported, or it could be simply criticized, resentfully opposed, or seen as a rejection for the parents’ provided food and the parents themselves. This often leads to overtly expressed resentment and pressure on the child to conform (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992).

Parents are viewed to be significant agents in the process of socializing their children in general, and concerning food attitudes in particular both in the social roles of family members and consumers (Eldridge and Murcott, 2000; Hughner and Maher, 2006; Rozin *et al.*, 1997; Ward, 1974). While many vegetarians are faced with criticism, parental support is direly needed to facilitate the implementation of new habits and achieving a level of habit automaticity, meaning making the change permanent, particularly in eating habits. The reason for this is probably that young children develop most of their habits and are susceptible to changing them due to modeling (Christian *et al.*, 2013; Hughner and Maher, 2006; Lagström *et al.*, 2001; Yee *et al.*, 2017). The influence or dietary preference can also be intergenerational, as it was shown in a study of girls that if a girl has a sense of identity in her being a vegetarian, she was more likely to abide by these intergenerational preferences as a means of supporting their current beliefs (Moore *et al.*, 2002).

Pressure is also applied on children when their behavior is viewed as deviant from the norms set by the family or the culture at large, and usually, the concerns for animal welfare are viewed as a “threat” especially among people with more conservative dispositions or dismissed as being brought forward by “immature,” “juvenile,” people who want to upset the established order (Jacobsson and Lindblom, 2016; MacInnis and Hodson, 2017).

It was also observed that mothers, their health beliefs, and their nutritional knowledge and awareness, alongside monitoring their child’s intake, were all strongly influential on the quality of a child’s diet; much more so than fathers (Hughner and Maher, 2006; Jones, 2009; Lagström *et al.*, 2001; Liu *et al.*, 2015; Peters *et al.*, 2012; Scaglioni *et al.*, 2018). Fathers, on the other hand, when presented with a vegetarian child’s decision to become vegetarian, tend to become very skeptical of its nutritional adequacy and even its motivation (Jab and Devine, 2000) and may assume the role of exerting pressure to eat certain available foods (Scaglioni *et al.*, 2018). The more

pertinent issue that needs to be investigated further is what parental style will lead to a higher acceptance of vegetarianism by the children?

2.6. Parental Styles

Parental styles as well as practices are emerging as important areas of study (Chen, 2020). They are an oft-cited influential factor on children’s behavior and on their food attitudes and eating tendencies. In the landmark research done by Baumrind (1991), four parental styles were identified to be related to food. These styles are identified on the dimensions of *demandingness* (providing consistent and firm limitations when making decisions pertaining to food and exercise choices) and *responsiveness* (the warmth provided to the child, and the parental involvement in food and exercise choices). As the name “responsiveness” suggests, this essentially means the degree to which a parent is responsive to the child’s nutritional and non-nutritional needs, cues, and behaviors (Savage *et al.*, 2007). These are outlined in Figure 1.

Figure-1. Parenting Style Matrix

	Low responsiveness <i>Parent is parent-centered</i>	High responsiveness <i>Parent is child-centered</i>
Low demandingness <i>Parent expects little of child</i>	Neglectful parenting <i>Parent is uninvolved with child</i>	Permissive parenting <i>Parent is indulgent toward child</i>
High demandingness <i>Parent expects much of child</i>	Authoritarian parenting <i>Parent is power-assertive over child</i>	Authoritative parenting <i>Relationship between parent and child is reciprocal</i>

The most studied types of these four are *Authoritative* and *Authoritarian* parenting styles. In authoritative parenting style, the parents are nurturing, responsive, and supportive, yet set firm limits for their children. They attempt to control children's behavior by explaining rules, discussing, and reasoning. They listen to a child's viewpoint but don't always accept it. The authoritarian parenting is an extremely strict parenting style. It places high expectations on children with little responsiveness. As an authoritarian parent, one focuses more on obedience, discipline, control rather than nurturing their child. However, the children they raise are typically good at following rules (Baumrind, 1991). The question that we seek to address is which parenting style is more influential towards the food consumption behavior of children.

As far as consumption behavior is concerned, food is no longer considered a staple item is characterized by impulsive purchases; rather, it is now shown that food is a high involvement product due to its being a basic necessity and due to the increased environmental and health-related awareness consumers are currently exhibiting (Kapoor, 2015). Studies have shown that there is a parental impact on the consumption behavior of children that varies across products (being higher for products that have a higher perceived risk), situations, and consumers themselves (varying based on demographic factors of the family) (Hughner and Maher, 2006).

With rapidly changing foodways and consumption behaviors, food manufacturers and retailers are constantly luring consumers into buying their products with an abundance of novel, favorable offerings (McIlveen *et al.*, 1999). On par with the growth of concerns surrounding meats and animal-related products alongside the trend towards meat reduction for adults, several manufacturers and retailers started including meat replacement products and better-presented vegetables in another attempt to increase purchase (McIlveen *et al.*, 1999).

Further research has been called for in examining the relationship between the eating behaviors of children and the parental styles their parents exhibit (Chen, 2020). Thus, this study investigates the relationship between parental styles and the tendency of a child to have a certain food attitude that pertains to vegetarianism or meat-eating. It is concerned with the behavioral and cognitive aspects leading to children being raised as vegetarians or meat-eaters, and some implications on their consumer behavior.

3. Research Questions

This study focuses on the behavioral aspect of the child’s eating and consumption, and its relationship with the parental style a caregiver exhibits in relation to food. Specifically, we investigate two key questions:

1. What is the relationship between parental dietary patterns and their children’s patterns and food attitude?
2. How, if at all, do the different parental styles affect the child’s likelihood of compliance to the parents’ chosen dietary pattern?

3.1. Methodology

3.1.1. Sampling and Participants

A dyadic set consisting of parents and their children was used in this study. The convenience sample consisted of families of at least three individuals, where both the mother and father were considered as caregivers. The sample consists of these families whose dietary patterns and food attitudes are directed and characterized by certain

ideological phenomena such as vegetarianism, predominately, and meat eating from a moral or religious standpoint, alongside other restrictions, or normative frameworks. Children that are subjects of this study are ones in the pre-teen age range; ones that are between the ages of 9 and 12, since the relationship between specific children's food behaviors and the parental styles they are subjected to begins to weaken around the age of 13 (Tang *et al.*, 2020), and that children older than 10 years of age may be more influential in the decision making process. The income and socioeconomic class of the participants was taken into account to determine whether their behaviors are affected in some way or another by these variables.

3.1.2. Questionnaire Design

For the parents, information needed included both their parental styles questionnaire adapted from the short version of the *Parental Styles & Dimensions Questionnaire* (Robinson *et al.*, 2001) alongside the creation of the items needed to assess their food preferences and whether they identify as vegetarians. For children, it was important to measure the reported degree of compliance with parents' food demands and correlate that with the parental style scores in order to identify which parental styles may be effective in transferring dietary habits and food attitudes to a child either through modelling or another mechanism from the ones identified above. Please see Appendix A for the questionnaire.

Parents were asked to generate a 9-character ID code and provide it to their children in order to calculate the means and correlations for response alongside an aggregate correlation suggesting the strength and direction of the relationship between parental style scores and the different responses of perceived parental styles and the different compliance scores calculated by asking the child to report whether they would just eat the available food, comply when asked to eat a certain food item, or eat a certain food item even if they do not like it.

A total of 204 responses (102 from parents and 102 from children) were received for the analysis of this study. A simple Pearson correlation analysis was deemed suitable.

4. Findings

The analysis was conducted in a manner of analyzing different variables in the child's dataset individually, followed by analyzing the parental behaviors and correlating them with the target variables outlined earlier and summarized as household income, level of education, among others. In light of these findings, an analysis of the relationship between both child and parent variables was conducted.

4.1. Child Insights

Significant correlations in children were found in several variables. A strong positive correlation was found between the children's concern with animal well-being and their tendency to not prefer eating meat due to this concern ($\rho=0.418$). Children who reported being punished when they do not eat the served food also tended to report that they perceive their parents as ones that demand them to eat whatever is served, the correlation between these two was a strong one amounting to ($\rho=0.512$).

Correlation between the child's preference to consume fast food and the reported parental discouragement of unhealthy food is very weak ($\rho=0.155$). The correlation between children who prefer to consume sweets and children whose parents discourage unhealthy foods is also very weak ($\rho=0.138$).

Moreover, the correlation between children who have high concern for animal wellbeing and children whose parents are perceived to have high concern for animal wellbeing is strong ($\rho=0.543$). Also, the correlation between children whose concern for animal wellbeing makes them not eat meat and children whose parents have high concern for animal wellbeing is high ($\rho=0.562$) which suggests that concern for animal wellbeing and its impact on diet is something that can be transmitted across generations.

The correlation between children who are punished when they do not eat served food and children whose parents demand they eat certain foods is $\rho=0.595$ suggesting a strong relationship between children's increased tendency to be punished and a high score on the perceived demandingness scale. Finally, the correlation between children who eat whatever food is served even if they do not like it and children whose parents explain to them why they should eat certain specified foods is negative ($\rho=-0.349$).

4.2. Parent and Child Insights

The most significant insights are the ones that favor the *authoritative parenting style* over both *authoritarian* and *permissive* ones when it comes to how they are related to the child's compliance with the parent's demands. The correlation found between authoritative parenting style and the likelihood of a child eating whatever they are instructed to eat despite disliking the food item was high ($\rho=0.295$). Following instruction in general is also uniquely correlated with authoritative parenting ($\rho=0.230$), while authoritarian parenting style is weakly and negatively correlated with eating whatever food is available at home ($\rho=-0.164$).

Significant correlations were found when male parents' tendency to instruct a child on what to eat was correlated with the parental styles. This may suggest that male parents are more involved with their female children than their male children. The tendency to instruct is positively correlated with authoritative $\rho=0.756$ and authoritarian $\rho=0.500$. Mothers were actually more likely to instruct their sons on what to eat while maintaining an authoritative parental style. The correlation between these two variables is $\rho=0.680$. When mothers' authoritative parental styles were correlated with their tendency to instruct their daughters, the correlation coefficient was,

paradoxically, $\rho = -0.266$. This may suggest that while mothers in this sample are actually more involved with their children's diet, there happens to be a disparity between how they deal with their sons as opposed to their daughters.

While household income is one of the variables related to the socioeconomic class of the parents and the children, an interesting correlation emerged between the parental styles and the household income. It turns out that an authoritative parental style is positively correlated with household income with a correlation coefficient ($\rho = 0.232$), while the authoritarian parental style is negatively correlated with household income. Household income was also found to have no significant correlation on the likelihood of compliance to parental instructions or conforming to the subjective norms of the family.

5. Conclusion

This study is concerned with the relationship between parental styles and the tendency of a child (aged 9-12) to have a certain food attitude that pertains to vegetarianism or meat-eating. Specifically, we focused on two research questions. First, regarding the relationship between parental dietary patterns and their children's patterns and food attitude, we found that children, not surprisingly, tend to imitate their parents' eating patterns. In our study, approximately 59% of children willingly follow their parents, while 22% are coerced to align with their parents' vegetarian diet preferences.

The second question related to the impact of different parental styles on the child's likelihood of compliance to the parents' chosen dietary pattern. In our study, we found that the parental style most associated with child compliance to parental food choices regarding vegetarianism is the *authoritative parental style*, which consists of a parent who is high on both *demandingness and responsiveness* to child's needs.

Household income was associated positively with authoritative parenting, and negatively with authoritarian parenting. Moreover, parents who have lower household incomes were found to be more verbally hostile and physically coercive, whereas as income increases, parents are more likely to have high connection scores and autonomy granting scores. Household income, however, did not have any correlation with the likelihood of compliance with parental food choices regarding vegetarianism.

As far as children are concerned, it was found that parents who *demand* that their children eat certain food items, were less likely to accept their food choices. Not surprisingly, a strong positive correlation was found between the children's concern with animal wellbeing and their tendency to not prefer eating meat due to this concern.

Further Research

Further research is recommended to be conducted on the causal relationships between the different genders and the parental styles displayed by the parents towards their children. Parental styles have also been associated in a number of ways and directions with household income. While the correlations are significant, the reason behind them in this research cannot exceed the boundaries of speculation, and further research may be needed to identify the cause of such a relationship and whether the degree of felt deprivation or conservatism over one's financial resources may be an intervening variable.

References

- Adams, C. J. (2018). *The sexual politics of meat*. Routledge. 548-57.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1): 56-95.
- Beardsworth, A. D. and Keil, E. T. (1991). Vegetarianism, veganism, and meat avoidance: Recent trends and findings. *British Food Journal*, 93(4): 19-24.
- Beardsworth, A. D. and Keil, E. T. (1992). The vegetarian option: varieties, conversions, motives, and careers. *The Sociological Review*, 40(2): 253-93.
- Boyle, J. E. (2011). Becoming Vegetarian: The Eating Patterns and Accounts of Newly Practicing Vegetarians. *Food and Foodways*, 19(4): 314-33.
- Chen (2020). Parenting styles, parenting practices, and dietary intakes of preschoolers and their parents. Electronic theses and dissertations. 4996. Available: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/4996>
- Chen and Pham, M. T. (2019). Affect regulation and consumer behavior. *Consumer Psychology Review*, 2(1): 114-44. Available: [doi:10.1002/arcv.1050](https://doi.org/10.1002/arcv.1050)
- Christian, M. S., Evans, C. E., Hancock, N., Nykjaer, C. and Cade, J. E. (2013). Family meals can help children reach their 5 A Day: a cross-sectional survey of children's dietary intake from London primary schools. *J. Epidemiol Community Health*, 67(4): 332-38.
- Cudworth, D. (2020). Promoting an emotional connection to nature and other animals via forest school: disrupting the spaces of neoliberal performativity. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 41(3/4): 506-21.
- Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4): 227-68.
- Eldridge, J. and Murcott, A. (2000). Adolescents' dietary habits and attitudes: Unpacking the 'problem of (parental) influence. *Health*, 4(1): 25-49.
- Fan, A., Almanza, B., Mattila, A. S., Ge, L. and Her, E. (2019). Are vegetarian customers more "green"? *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 22(5): 467-82.

- Hargreaves, S. M., Raposo, A., Saraiva, A. and Zandonadi, R. P. (2021). Vegetarian Diet: An Overview through the perspective of quality of life domains. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(8): 4067. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084067>
- Hewitt, A. M. and Stephens, C. (2007). Healthy eating among 10 – 13-year-old New Zealand children: Understanding choice using the Theory of Planned Behaviour and the role of parental influence. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 12(5): 526-35.
- Hughner, R. S. and Maher, J. K. (2006). Factors that influence parental food purchases for children: Implications for dietary health. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(9-10): 929-54.
- Jab, J., J. S. and Devine, C. M. (2000). Managing vegetarianism: Identities, norms and interactions. *Ecology of Food and Nutrition*, 39(5): 375-94.
- Jacobsson, K. and Lindblom, J. (2016). *Deviance management. In: Animal rights activism: A moral-sociological perspective on social movements (protest and social movements)*. S.L. Amsterdam University Press. 103-27.
- Jones (2009). Taking up space? How customers react to health information and health icons on restaurant menus. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 12(4): 344-63. Available: [doi: 10.1080/15378020903344299](https://doi.org/10.1080/15378020903344299)
- Jones and Kervin, L. (2011). An experimental study on the effects of exposure to magazine advertising on children's food choices. *Public Health Nutrition*, 14(8): 1337-44.
- Kalof, L., Dietz, T., Stern, P. C. and Guagnano, G. A. (1999). Social psychological and structural influences on vegetarian beliefs. *Rural Sociology*, 64(3): 500-11.
- Kapoor, N. K. S. (2015). Does the consumers' buying behavior differ for vegetarian and non-vegetarian food products? Evidences from an emerging market. *British Food Journal*, 117(8): 1-25.
- Klesges, R. C., Stein, R. J., Eck, L. H., Isbell, T. R. and Klesges, L. M. (1991). Parental influence on food selection in young children and its relationships to childhood obesity. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 53(4): 859-64.
- Kotler, J. A., Schiffman, J. M. and Hanson, K. G. (2012). The influence of media characters on children's food choices. *Journal of Health Communication*, 17(8): 886-98.
- Kumar, J., Adhikari, K., Li, Y., Lindshield, E., Muturi, N. and Kidd, T. (2016). Identifying barriers, perceptions and motivations related to healthy eating and physical activity among 6th to 8th grade, rural, limited-resource adolescents. *Health Education*, 116(2): 123-37.
- Lagström, H., Seppänen, R., Jokinen, E., Salminen, M. and Simell, O. (2001). The impact of child-targeted dietary counseling of parents on food (milk) preferences of preschool-aged children in the STRIP project. *Scandinavian Journal of Nutrition*, 45(1): 51-56.
- Liu, C., Cai, X. and Zhu, H. (2015). Eating out ethically: An analysis of the influence of ethical food consumption in a vegetarian restaurant in Guangzhou, China. *Geographical Review*, 105(4): 551-65.
- MacInnis, C. C. and Hodson, G. (2017). It ain't easy eating greens: Evidence of bias toward vegetarians and vegans from both source and target. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 20(6): 721-44.
- Marshall, D., Anderson, A., Lean, M. and Foster, A. (1994). Healthy eating: Fruit and Vegetables in Scotland. *British Food Journal*, 96(7): 18-24.
- McEvoy, C. T. and Woodside, J. V. (2015). Vegetarian diets. *Pediatric Nutrition in Practice*, 113: 134-38. Available: [doi: 10.1159/000367873](https://doi.org/10.1159/000367873)
- McIlveen, H., Abraham, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999). Meat avoidance and the role of replacers. *Nutrition and Food Science*, 99(1): 29-36.
- Milichovský, F. and Mráček, P., 2020. "Customers' behaviour during purchasing vegetarian products in global retail environment." In *SHS Web of Conferences (Vol. 74, p. 04016)*. EDP Sciences.
- Moore, E. S., Wilkie, W. L. and Lutz, R. J. (2002). Passing the torch: Intergenerational influences as a source of brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(2): 17-37.
- Nathan, I., Hackett, A. and Kirby, S. (1997). A longitudinal study of the growth of matched pairs of vegetarian and omnivorous children, aged 7–11 years, in the North-West of England. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 51(1): 20-25. Available: [doi:10.1038/sj.ejcn.1600354](https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1600354)
- Olfert, M. D., Barr, M. L., Mathews, A. E., Horacek, T. M., Riggsbee, K., Zhou, W. and Colby, S. E. (2020). Life of a vegetarian college student: Health, lifestyle, and environmental perceptions. *Journal of American College Health*: 1-8. Available: [doi:10.1080/07448481.2020.1740231](https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2020.1740231)
- Parletta, N., Peters, J., Owen, A., Tsiros, M. D. and Brennan, L. (2012). Parenting styles, communication and child/adolescent diets and weight status: let's talk about it. *Early Child Development and Care*, 182(8): 1089-103.
- Peters, J., Sinn, N., Campbell, K. and Lynch, J. (2012). Parental influences on the diets of 2–5-year-old children: systematic review of interventions. *Early Child Development and Care*, 182(7): 837-57.
- Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S. F. and Hart, C. H. (2001). The parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ). *Handbook of Family Measurement Techniques*, 3: 319-21.
- Rosenfeld, D. L., Rothgerber, H. and Tomiyama, A. J. (2020). Mostly vegetarian, but flexible about it: Investigating how meat-reducers express social identity around their diets. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 11(3): 405-16.
- Rozin, P. and Singh, L. (1999). The moralization of cigarette smoking in the united states. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 8(3): 321-37.

- Rozin, P., Markwith, M. and Stoess, C. (1997). Moralization and becoming a vegetarian: The transformation of preferences into values and the recruitment of disgust. *Psychological Science*, 8(2): 67-73.
- Savage, J. S., Fisher, J. O. and Birch, L. L. (2007). Parental influence on eating behavior: Conception to adolescence. *Law Med Ethics*, 35(1): 22-34.
- Scaglioni, S., De Cosmi, V., Ciappolino, V., Parazzini, F., Brambilla, P. and Agostoni, C. (2018). Factors influencing children's eating behaviours. *Nutrients*, 10(6): 706-23.
- Sommer, I. (2013). *An investigation of food choice behaviour and dietary intake of children, teenagers and adults with food allergies Doctoral dissertation*. University of Portsmouth.
- Tang, D., Bu, T. and Dong, X. (2020). Are parental dietary patterns associated with children's overweight and obesity in China? *BMC Pediatrics*, 20(1): 1-11.
- Ward, S. (1974). Consumer Socialization. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(2): 1-14.
- Yee, A. Z. H., Lwin, M. O. and Ho, S. S. (2017). The influence of parental practices on child promotive and preventive food consumption behaviors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 14(47): 2-14.

Appendix A

Child Questionnaire

1. ID Code
2. I have a high concern for animal wellbeing.
3. My concern for animal wellbeing usually makes me not eat meat.
4. I usually prefer to consume fast-food.
5. I usually prefer to consume meat/ beef.
6. I usually prefer to consume pork.
7. I usually prefer to consume dairy products.
8. I usually prefer to consume sweets.
9. I eat whatever is available at home.
10. I usually eat whatever my parent instructs me to eat.
11. When my parent instructs me to eat something I do not like, I usually eat it anyway.
12. My parents have high concern for animal wellbeing.
13. Discourages unhealthy foods.
14. Demands that I eat certain foods.
15. Demands that I eat whatever food is served.
16. When I do not eat the served food, I am usually punished.
17. Considers my likes and dislikes in food.
18. Buys me the food I ask for.
19. Accepts my food choices even if they are not shared with the family.
20. Explains to me why I should eat or not eat certain foods.
21. Age

Parents Questionnaire

1. ID Code
2. I have high concern for Animal welfare.
3. My concern for animal welfare usually makes me not eat meat.
4. My concern for animal welfare usually makes me not buy meat.
5. I usually consume fast food.
6. I usually consume meat/ beef.
7. I usually consume pork.
8. I usually consume dairy products.
9. I usually consume sweets.
10. I usually instruct my child on what to eat.
11. I demand that my child eat whatever food is available at home.
12. I would consider myself a vegetarian.

Parental Style Questionnaire

1. Responsive to child's feelings or needs.
2. Uses physical punishment as a way of disciplining our child.
3. Considers child's desires before asking the child to do something.
4. When child asks why (he)(she) has to obey rules, I state: "because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to."
5. Explains to child how we feel about the child's good and bad behavior.
6. Use mild physical punishment when our child is disobedient.
7. Encourages child to talk about the child's troubles.
8. Finds it difficult to discipline child.
9. Encourages child to freely express (him/herself) even when disagreeing with parents.
10. Punishes by taking pleasurable activities (Phone/ PlayStation/ Toys/ etc.) away from child with little if any explanations.
11. I clarify and stress the reasons for rules.

12. Gives comfort and understanding when child is upset.
13. Yells or shouts when child misbehaves.
14. Gives praise when child is good.
15. Gives into child when (he) (she) causes a fuss/ disturbance about something.
16. Shows anger towards child.
17. Threatens child with punishment more often than actually giving it.
18. Considers child's preferences in making plans for the family.
19. Grabs child when being disobedient.
20. States punishments to child and does not actually do them.
21. Shows respect for child's opinions by encouraging child to express them.
22. Allows child to give input into family rules.
23. Scolds and criticizes to make child improve.
24. Spoils child.
25. Gives child reasons why rules should be obeyed.
26. Uses threats as punishment with little or no justification.
27. Has warm and intimate times together with child.
28. Punishes by putting child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.
29. Helps child to understand the effect of behavior by encouraging child to talk about the effects of his/her own actions.
30. Scolds and criticizes when child's behavior does not meet our expectations.
31. Explains the effects of the child's behavior.
32. Hits child when the child misbehaves.