

Bachelor Thesis:

Framing Veganism

The Framing of Vegans and Vegan-diets in News Media

University of Twente, Enschede

Author:

Sebastian Leitz

Student No.:

s2596202

Study Program:

Public Governance across Borders

First Supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Antonia Graf

Second Supervisor:

Dr. Veronica junjan

Word Count:

9547

Date:

29.06.2022

Abstract

As meat consumption is growing globally, so are the impacts of meat-consumption on the environment and human health. Vegans renounce any consumption of animal products, as they entirely oppose animal-farming. Vegans still make up a small portion of the populations of industrialized nations. At the same time, their influence on the food industry is growing, apparent by the rising number of meat and dairy substitutes. Vegans still have to face many stereotypes and are still a fringe group of society. In this thesis, I will look at the framing of vegans in two newspapers in the last two year, *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. The goal is to answer the following question: What frames are used to frame vegans and veganism in news media? An inductive framing analysis will be conducted, identifying the frames used in these newspapers by analyzing the content of newspaper articles about veganism and vegan diets, using the four frame elements of Entman (1993). Vegans focus on environmental, health and animal welfare as problems in the industrialized world, that can be solved by turning vegan. Opposition sees this as an attack on western culture and an infringement on the right of free choice.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Veganism.....	6
3. Theory	7
3.1 Framing theory	7
3.2 Framing of Veganism	9
4. Methodology	10
4.1 Case selection	10
4.2 Document Collection.....	10
4.3 Content analysis	11
4.4 Positionality Statement.....	12
5. Results	13
5.1 Problem definition	13
5.2 Causal interpretation.....	15
5.3 Moral evaluation.....	15
5.4 Treatment recommendation	16
5.5 Economic opportunity of vegan alternative products.....	17
6. Discussion	18
6.1 Polarization around identity	19
6.2 Veganism as a market opportunity	20
7. Conclusion.....	21
References	22
Appendices	25
Appendix A: Codebook.....	25
Appendix B: List of Articles	30

1. Introduction

At this moment in time, there are roughly 23 billion chicken alive on earth. 66 billion chickens get killed for human consumption every year. Additionally, 1.5 billion pigs and 300 million cattly get killed anually (Adams 2022, p. 125). While these numbers are high, global meat consumption is on the rise (Twine 2017). The rapid and still ongoing expansion of the animal agricultural sector comes with different consequences. Climate change is accelerated by the high number of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions connected to meat production (Jallinoja et al. 2020, p. 5). In fact, it is expected that animal agriculture is responsible for somewhere between 14.5 percent and 51 percent of global GHG emissions. This is especially due to the methane produced by cattle, both for meat and milk production, as methane warms up the atmosphere 14 times faster than CO₂. Moreover, the conditions of factory farming, in which most of the livestock is kept, are terrible. Unlike the stereotypical image of cows spread on green grass, most animals have little space and are clumped up together. This creates massive stress for the animals, and often leads to injuries or deaths due to heat, panic, or fights over dominance. These conditions and the subsequent killing of these billions of animals cause ethical concerns. Additionally, meat consumption poses health risks for humans. There is sufficient evidence that the consumption of red and processed meats causes different types of cancers (Bouvard et al. 2015; Domingo and Nadal 2017). In animal farming, many farmers feed their animals antibiotics, which has led to the development of antibiotic-resistant viruses. Even the spread of Covid-19 can be traced back to a wet-market, a place where meat of wild animals is sold (Mizumoto et al. 2020).

All these factors have led to people limiting their consumption of meat and other animal products. This is especially the case for industrialized countries, where most people do not have to worry about consuming enough calories. Whilst globally, meat consumption is still rising, in industrialised countries the number of people who consume meat and dairy is declining slowly (Janssen et al 2016, p. 643; Saari et al 2021, p. 163). There is a big variety of diets, and as a result a variety of diets who eat less or no animal products. Flexitarians are people, who purposefully try to consume less meat, for example by choosing any number of days in the week on which they do not eat any meat products. Pescetarians cut out all meat, but still eat fish and dairy. Vegetarians eat neither meat nor fish, but still consume other animal products, mainly eggs and milk products. Vegans choose an even stricter lifestyle, where they voluntarily limit their consumption of animal products to the lowest extent possible. As a dietary choice, this means not consuming meat, fish, seafood, eggs, milk, and any other milk product. Veganism can be seen as a lifestyle, as people do not only restrict their diet, but also avoid any other animal products, such as any leather products and fur (Kerschke-Risch 2015, p. 99; Jallinoja et al. 2020, p. 2)

In many industrialized countries, the number of vegans is on the rise (Janssen et al. 2016). In Germany, the number of vegans has more than doubled in the last years. It is difficult to find exact estimates, but Kerschke-Risch (2015, p.98) estimates that there were around 1.2 million vegans in 2014, and there might be up to 4 million vegans today, accounting for up to five percent of the German population

(Bundesvereinigung der Deutschen Ernährungsindustrie 2021, p. 19). However, this number could be lower, as people in surveys are prone to social desirability bias, tending to answer what they think is socially more accepted (Kerschke-Risch 2015, p. 98). The numbers are likely to grow, as veganism is a trend especially among young people. Most vegans are under 35 years old, between 66 and 80 percent of vegans are women, and vegans have a higher level of education than the average (Kerschke-Risch 2015; Janssen et al. 2016). As the number of people living a vegan lifestyle is growing, their influence on western society increases. Meat consumption is sinking, while there are more and more vegan alternative products available in supermarkets and stores, such as plant milks and plant-based meat. Most big food producing companies, such as *Nestlé* and *Danone* have at least one purely plant-based food substitute brand. And even more and more car companies are offering vegan leather alternatives for their cars' interior. Those offers are not only chosen by vegans, but other people trying to limit their consumption of animal products buy them as well. This means that the push for more vegan products has an impact on a wide variety of consumers, as there are more sustainable options available.

However, vegans are still sometimes stigmatized for their uncommon lifestyle and diet (Phillips 2019, p. 160). Meat-eating is associated with a more right-wing political orientation, and some right-wing personalities have taken the issue of veganism as a cultural issue they try to polarize around (Grünhage and Reuter 2021, p. 32-35). On the contrary, some vegans see it as their goal to try to convince as many other people as possible to change their eating habits. Since there is little research done on how veganism and vegans are portrayed in news media coverage, I will use Framing theory in this paper to understand how both are framed in news media. Frames are central organizing ideas, used by people to make sense of relevant events (Gamson and Modigliani 1989). Frame analysis helps to find the narratives behind a topic, which is especially useful for controversial topics, with a lot of differing opinions (Fischer 2003). The views on and narratives about veganism that are portrayed in the news media show the clash between vegans and meat-eaters. Uncovering the Frames behind this dispute may help understand the debate (Fischer 2003). Looking at newspaper articles about vegan diets and lifestyle as well as veganism, I try to answer the following research question:

What frames are used to frame vegans and veganism in news media?

Comparing two German newspapers, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, over a two-year period, I will look into how vegans are portrayed by public news outlets in Germany, and how vegans portray themselves. Why are they still a fringe group of society with low numbers of members, and how do they manage to still exert pressure on the food industry to change their range of offered products? Are there differences between how vegans are framed in the two newspapers? In the following parts I will first provide an additional overview about the history of veganism, reason why people choose to follow a vegan diet. Secondly, I will look at the framing theory and previous papers which relate to framing of veganism. A method section will explain how the two newspapers have been studied. Then the findings will be presented and discussed.

2. Veganism

The first vegan association was called the *Vegan Society*. It was established in 1944 in the UK. The *Vegan Society* defines veganism as a lifestyle

“[...] which seeks to exclude—as far as is possible and practicable—all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose; and by extension, promotes the development and use of animal-free alternatives for the benefit of animals, humans and the environment. In dietary terms it denotes the practice of dispensing with all products derived wholly or partly from animals.” (The Vegan Society 2022).

This means, vegans do not only restrict their own consumption, but they also strive for alternatives, and the promotion of their lifestyle. Still, it took many years until veganism became a known word for main parts of society, and not only fringe animal rights groups. Nowadays veganism has become more and more established as influential part on society, as shown in the introduction.

This change of image in the last years can be attributed to media coverage, changing the image of meat production (Jallinoja et al. 2020). Leaked footage of factory farms and movies about the downsides of meat consumption such as *Cowspiracy* and *Carnage* have changed how many consumers see animal agriculture. Social media influencers, celebrities and athletes, such as actor Joaquin Phoenix and Serena Williams, have shown their support for vegans online. Food bloggers and influencers show how easy to cook, healthy, and tasty vegan food can be. Vegan pledges to try veganism for a limited amount of time give a sense of community and peer support, and many people either understand afterwards why others are vegan, or they choose to become vegan themselves. And lastly, a new wave of plant-based meat, fish, and dairy substitutes are available nowadays, which gives the feeling that vegans do not even miss anything. (Jallinoja et al. 2020, p. 9-14)

The reasons to become vegan have slightly evolved. Animal-related motives like animal welfare, animal rights and the ethical issues that come with the killing of other living beings for the own nourishment are the primary motives to become vegan, mentioned by almost ninety percent of vegans (Janssen et al. 2016, p. 647). Self-related motives such as personal well-being, health advantages, taste, and weight loss are the reason for more than two-thirds of vegans. Studies show that vegans are less likely to suffer of cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, obesity and select cancers than the average consumer in industrialized countries (Bye et al. 2021). Additionally, a vegan diet can add up to 10 years of life expectancy, depending on the age at the point of switching (Fadnes et al. 2022). Almost half of vegans also mentioned environment-related motives, mostly focusing on climate change prevention and environmental protection (Janssen et al. 2016, p. 647). This is based on studies that show that a plant-based diet produces on average roughly half the amount of CO₂ of a diet including meat (Scarborough et al. 2014). Other reasons are reporting on food scandals connection to animal products, critiques of capitalism and the food industry, and religious reasons (Kerschke-Risch 2015, p. 101). There are people

who might be convinced by at least some of the arguments others use to justify their transition to veganism. However, they see barriers to switching their diet. Those barriers can be a high cost associated with veganism, time associated with reading labels to check the ingredients and with cooking and planning a full diet, convenience, and the feeling of being restricted in their dietary choices (Parkinson et al. 2019). There are also health concerns, especially about deficiency of specific nutrients, namely protein, iron, and vitamins, even though a balanced and proficient diet will prevent most deficiencies. The only vitamin vegans cannot absorb via plants and that they have to substitute, is vitamin B12. However, some companies add vitamin B12 to their products, for example done by *Oatly* in some of their oat milk products, which then allows vegans to not take any other supplements.

Grünhage and Reuter (2021) identify different justifications used by people to continue eating meat. Firstly, people see themselves at the top of the food chain and justify their position by saying that humans are the smartest living being on this planet, hence they are entitled to eat animals that cannot defend themselves. Secondly, dichotomization between animals as pets and animals as livestock differentiates between different types of animals. Both these arguments are criticized for being specieist by vegans. Thirdly, dissociation and avoidance try to evade thoughts about the food. Religious justifications focus on God's creation, and how humans are thus entitled to eat animals. Lastly, cultural justifications revolve around earlier generations and ancestors having consumed meat, and thereby humans nowadays are supposed to continue this tradition (Grünhage and Reuter 2021, p. 28f.).

3. Theory

3.1 Framing theory

The concept of Framing is omnipresent in social sciences, but there is a lack of a clear definition or understanding (Entman 1993, p. 51). In the following, I will first provide an overview on the terms *frames* and *framing* and then clarify how they are used in this work.

Frames are central organizing ideas used by people to make sense of relevant events (Gamson and Modigliani 1989, p. 3). They are preexisting theories of any situation (Goffman 1974; van Hulst and Yanow 2016, p. 94f.). In order to understand and process any situation, the mind uses these preexisting schemas to classify the situation and to put it in context to previously experienced events (Entman 1993, p. 53). Thereby, frames allow people “to locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occur[-]rences defined in [their] terms” (Goffman 1974, p. 21). Goffman (1974) differentiates between natural and social frames. Natural frames identify undirected, unoriented occurrences of the physical world, whereas social frames provide background understanding for events where actors are involved. The latter help to make sense of the intentions of other actors. Those actions can be conscious and with a certain motive in mind. They will be the focus of this paper.

For the purpose of empirical analysis, Entman (1991) looks for frames in news articles. He finds frames at two distinct levels, in the mind of people reading the article and processing its contents, and in the news texts themselves. Scheufele (1999) extends this concept. On the one hand, frames are mentally stored clusters to help the individual process information. On the other hand, frames can be seen as part of the media discourse. Through selection of certain information over others, journalists increase the salience of certain parts of the news story. This can but does not have to be on purpose. It is essential in news because journalists need to quickly classify and identify information and provide it to their audiences (Scheufele 1999). The differences between frames in the mind and in the news are also explored by Dewulf et al (2009) who works out a cognitive and an interactional approach. Cognitive frames act as “memory structures that help us to organize and interpret incoming perceptual information by fitting it into pre-existing categories about reality” (Dewulf et al. 2009, p. 159). These cognitive frames help to structure expectations about people, objects, events and settings to put the incoming information into context. Interactional frames are about the interpretation of interactions, indicating how an interaction should be understood by the partaking actors. This focuses more on the meta-narrative and the notions conveyed in the discourse, rather than the content of the discourse.

Snow and Benford (1988) define framing as the active act of assigning meaning to and interpreting relevant events and conditions in order to obtain the support of others. By assigning this frame to an action, event, or issue, one can try to convince others to see the action, event or issue from the same perspective – or put differently, in the same frame. Benford and Snow look at how social movements frame issues to garner bystanders’ support and demobilize antagonists. They identify three core tasks framing has to fulfill. First, *diagnostic framing* has to blame and attribute cause to the issue opponent. Then, through *prognostic framing*, solutions can be proposed to tackle the issue. Finally, *motivational framing* is used to motivate bystanders to engage in action. If the framing tasks interact and cohere, the framing can be seen as successful. Other factors of success are the resonance of the individuals’ core values with the used frames, the commensurability, and the empirical credibility of the frames (Snow and Benford 1988, p. 208ff.).

As most definitions of Frames are rather vague, they cannot be used as empirical indicator to identify frames consistently (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 264). Built on the definitions of Benford and Snow and Gamson, Entman (1993) comes up with a clearer and operationizable definition. Frames can consist of up to four elements, namely a problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and treatment recommendation (Entman 1993, p. 52). A problem definition can be both the issue at stake and actors discussing the problem, detecting what happens and why (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 264). A causal interpretation is seen as the forces and reasons behind an issue (Entman 1993, p. 52). Actors and other objects (e.g., policies) can be accredited both failure and success regarding a specific outcome (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 264). A moral evaluation makes a moral judgement to assess agents or objects morally, and can be either negative, positive, or neutral. Lastly, a treatment recommendation can

contain a call for or against action and can also provide a solution or offer and justify treatments for the issue (Entman 1993, p. 52; Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 264). These four frame elements can be used as variables to measure frames (Matthes and Kohring 2008; Atanasova 2019). This enables a coder to look for more precise textual elements, while conducting an inductive, qualitative content analysis.

3.2 Framing of Veganism

Research into the framing of veganism is scarce. Sievert et al. (2021) looked into the news media framing of red and processed meat (RPM) consumption. RPM reduction was seen as a complex issue with scientific dissensus, and as a two-sided conflict. Excessive RPM consumption is mostly attributed to individual dietary choices and as the responsibility of individual consumer on the side against the reduction of RPM consumption. They fear restrictions of their civil liberties and their enjoyment, and they see the other side as trying to destroy both the meat industry and innocent farmers (Sievert et al. 2021, p. 582f.). This argumentation is followed up only with vague solutions. The other side, advocating for RPM-reduction, points out a lack of awareness of the individual, which has led to an eating culture that supports the corporate interests of farmers and food manufacturers involved in producing RPM products at the expense of the planet and societies. They especially point out GHG emissions and chronic health burdens as big issues. A meat tax, removing subsidies for farmers, creating alternative products and improved farming technology are seen as possible solutions (Sievert et al. 2021, p. 582f.). Both sides try to discredit and delegitimize the opponents, and especially the side against the reduction of RPM consumption follows a conspiratorial route, blaming the vegan agenda for the discourse. The vegan agenda is seen as form of social control that is to be pushed onto them by an anonymous elite or a power-hungry government that wants to control the people as much as possible. This is connected to the populist thought that this elite wants to shame and blame the meat-eaters, while only the elite can afford alternatives to meat, which means that the people from the low and middle classes are left feeling ashamed, but with no alternative (Sievert et al. 2021, p. 548).

Mittal and Brüggemann (2019) found veganism connected to a frame of tradition and entitlement. This comes from traditional plant-based recipes being rebranded as vegan. The problem of climate change was named by journalists in connection to reducing meat-consumption as a possible solution. Previously known plant-based dishes could help implement alternative diets. These traditional dishes are mostly produced with local ingredients that are widely available, which makes veganism more accessible for everyone. While their study did not focus on vegan diets, they were surprised by the high frequency of reporting on this topic, meaning that it has arrived at the center of journalistic attention (Mittal and Brüggemann 2019, p. 19)

Lastly, Phillips (2018) looks into the framing of vegan parent in newspapers. He conducts discourse analysis to show how certain perspectives are included, and others excluded from the public discourse. They find a connection in the articles between vegan parenting and child nourishment (Phillips 2019, p. 161). By mentioning anecdotal evidence of stories of vegan parents whose children were malnourished,

they try to establish an association between vegan parenting and child malnourishment, even though there is only a small number of incidences of this happening worldwide. By anticipating counterarguments and answering them in advance, there is little to no chance for vegan parents to change this narrative. The focus is only on health-based arguments and the question whether children can be raised vegan and healthy at the same time (Phillips 2019, p. 163). Other arguments for the vegan upbringing of one's children, such as moral, religious, or environmental reasons, cannot be used as justification for vegan parenting. As a result, different perspectives are disregarded by the dominant health-based frame.

4. Methodology

4.1 Case selection

Newspaper analysis is quite common for framing analysis. It enables the researcher to analyze the formation of public opinion on an issue (Gamson and Modigliani 1989, p. 3). It is important to note that news media do not necessarily influence public opinion, nor vice versa. However, they are contributing to each other through constant interaction of journalists with the public, and the consumption of media by the public. The measurement of this influence is not the goal of this paper. Rather, I want to show the narratives of the discussed topics, as well as how they are represented (Gamson and Modigliani 1989, p. 2f.; Entman 1991, p. 7). This can give insights on the public perception of a topic, and an overview over the current positions of the public on this topic. Daily newspapers are the most common source of information for many people (Kühne 2011, p. 245). Hence the portrayal of a topic in this type of news media can give insights on the public presentation and common narratives. Consequently, I have chosen newspaper analysis for this research.

The two German newspapers that were chosen are *Süddeutsche Zeitung (SZ)* and *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)*, which are both published daily. Germany is an industrialized country, where veganism is on the rise, but still a recent trend (Kerschke-Risch 2015; Sievert et al. 2021). *SZ* is positioned liberal in regards to values, and socially oriented economically, while *FAZ* is economically liberal, but portrays more conservative values (Kühne 2011, p. 245). Both newspapers do not strictly adhere to one political position and try to embody a broad variety of positions to allow discourse. This allows for an analysis of articles from positions across the political spectrum, encompassing many different opinions, while excluding radical viewpoints.

4.2 Document Collection

The articles were taken from the databases of the two online newspapers (*SZ.de* and *FAZ.Net*). The search term was “vegan*”. This means, all German terms for vegan (as adjective: *vegan*), vegan (as the person pursuing this lifestyle: *Veganer*er(in)*), and veganism (*Veganismus*) and all possible declinations were included in the search. The timeframe was first of May 2020 until first of May 2022.

This timeframe was chosen to contain a sufficient sample of articles, and it is quite common to take the last two years of published articles to show recent public discourse (cf. Atanasova 2019; Mittal and Brüggemann 2019). Counting articles that were published multiple times only once, SZ.de came to 372 articles, FAZ.Net came to 399 articles, and altogether 771 articles. Each article was added to an Excel spreadsheet, containing information about the name of the article, the author, the date, the wordcount, the number of appearances in the database and if it contained the word *vegan* in the headline or not. I scanned through each article individually and checked if it fit the topic of this analysis in any way, by looking at the headline, the sub header and searching for the word *vegan* in the articles. If the term appeared multiple times and was discussed in any further way, I included the articles in further analysis. Most of the articles were recipes and restaurant critiques, and many only mentioned the word *vegan* once or twice, but not showing any significant meaning with it. In that case, such articles were not chosen for further analysis. 82 articles were found for further analysis, 31 from *SZ*, and 51 from *FAZ*. I read through every one of those individually and checked if they were connected to the topic of this analysis. This was the case for 63 of them. For inductive newspaper framing analysis, a sample size of around 50-60 articles is common (cf. Atanasova 2019; Mittal and Brüggemann 2019). These were coded, following methods set out in the next section.

4.3 Content analysis

Framing analysis can be done in many ways, varying on the theoretical concept of framing and the chosen methodology. Methods can overlap and share some features. Both content and discourse analysis, and both deductive and inductive methods can be used to find frames. Discourse analysis is used to understand meta-frames, looking critically at how things are framed, to set or change the agenda of the public discourse. To find out which frames are used, content analysis has to be conducted.

Matthes and Kohring identify several methods how frames can be analyzed. A deductive approach is regularly used (van Gorp, p. 91). Frames are set by studying previous literature and asking experts on the subject. A codebook is established on the basis of these frames. This limits the researcher in their findings, as there is no flexibility to incorporate new insights (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 262f.). As there is little literature on the framing of veganism, this method is not suited for this analysis.

There is a plethora of inductive methods. The hermeneutic approach identifies frames by qualitatively interpreting media texts, using a small sample to describe frames in depth. This method is very prone to researcher bias due to the very small sample size and often not transparent, so it is not useful for this thesis (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 259f.). The linguistic approach analyzes the selection, placement, and structure of specific words and sentences in a text. Specific words and linguistic devices are seen as the building blocks of frames. It builds on a thorough systematic analysis and is not fit for large text samples. The focus is on the linguistic elements (i.e. figures of speech) of a frame and their meaning (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 260). It is similar to the hermeneutic approach in both the sample size and the uncertainty how the features come together to build a frame.

Computer-assisted methods identify frames by examining specific vocabularies in texts. They find particular words that do occur together in some texts and do not occur together in other texts using cluster algorithms in a process called frame-mapping. This approach misses out on the duality and variance in human language and reduces the frames to story topics (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 261f.). The “human component” is missing, not showing how the words are connected. Walter and Ophir combine this method with semantic network analysis and multiple community detection methods. This means they can group words that occur together multiple times into groups, showing frames. They find this combination of a computer-assisted method and multiple types of network analysis to work similarly to other framing analysis methods (Walter and Ophir 2019, p. 254f.).

Lastly, there is the manual holistic approach, which is used to find frames by manually looking at the data. Through multiple rounds of coding, a codebook for the different frame elements can be developed. As long as the criteria for the variables are clear, the extraction of frames can be transparent, creating a reliable and valid method (Matthes and Kohring 2008, p. 260f.). Atanasova (2019) uses this approach because of the size of her sample and the expectation to find new frames. She analyzes and open-codes 54 items, using Entmans (1993) previously mentioned four elements of frames. If a text part fits one of the elements, it is lifted into a table. The tables of the different data items are constantly compared to find similarities and differences. Articles with similar propositions are grouped together and re-read to identify implicit cultural phenomena, or frames (Atanasova 2019, p. 704). This method was used in this paper.

For this analysis, Atlas.ti will be used to conduct the content analysis. The coding will be done following a scheme of van Gorp, consisting of open coding, axial coding and selective coding in iterative steps (van Gorp, p. 93ff.). Firstly, texts are analyzed with as little bias as possible, being open to all findings. This step enables a comparison of the material and creates an inventory of indicators, which the reader might use to understand the text. These indicators are marked in the textual analysis software as quotations. Then the quotations are sorted and grouped together, marking them with codes and linking them to overarching ideas. This should highlight the similarities, differences and contrasts between different groups. Lastly, the codes are arranged in a frame matrix. This process is repeated multiple time, until mutually exclusive and exhaustive codes are created. Finally, it is looked at how the variables fit together with other variables of other frame elements.

4.4 Positionality Statement

How I view veganism and meat-based diets does have an influence on this research, with potential influence to almost all parts of this study (Sievert et al. 2021, p. 581). I acknowledge that meat and dairy consumption play a vital role in the nutrition of many people. At the same time, there are countless humans who do not have enough food at all. The burden of veganism and the reduction of meat and dairy consumption is not to fall on them. Meat and dairy consumption are an important part of many cultures and cuisines. However, in my view modern animal farming comes with ecological and moral

challenges for the industrialized world. Veganism is one of the possible options of reducing meat and dairy consumption and production in regions of the world, where there are enough nutritional options, and where this consumption exceeds both the human need and planetary boundaries. The goal of this paper is to show how veganism is portrayed, and not to compare between different options of meat reduction, nor to make any judgement about people who do not reduce their intake of animal products.

5. Results

A total amount of 63 articles was used for the analysis, containing on average 1108 words. Overall, 67 codes were created to assess the content of the news articles. They were attributed – if fitting – to one or multiple of the frame elements. One code that came up quite often was veganism being an established and accepted diet in western society. People are familiar with what veganism is. Throughout the analysis, three distinct sentiments became apparent. Veganism was viewed either positive, neutral, or negatively. In the following parts, the findings for the four frame elements will be presented.

5.1 Problem definition

Veganism is viewed as a complicated topic. Complicated issues are usually less likely to be picked up by government agendas, as uncertainty over the topic can lead to indecisiveness of the politicians, and uncertainty as to how the issue can be resolved (Sievert et al. 2021, p. 582). The clash between vegans on the one side and consumers of animal products on the other side was mentioned as an issue in this complex subject. Vegans and articles favoring veganism focused especially on environmental harms of animal products and the animal agricultural sector. The effects of animal farming onto climate change have been laid out in previous parts of this thesis. An additional problem vegans saw was the exploitation and killing of animals for human consumption. They felt this was going against their moral values of being benevolent to other living beings and caring for their surroundings. Another problem vegans faced and pointed out was hatred directed at them. One article describes the situation a food manufacturing company found itself in, after they announced to produce vegan products: “It hailed puking-emojis, insults against vegans, threats of boycotting products, obscure comparisons to Nazis and the announcement, to throw away any products already purchased by the food manufacturer”¹ (article 2). While this hatred was shown online, other articles also document insults yelled at people (article 39). This can leave a feeling of insecurity and unrest with vegans. Health was another important point. The health disadvantages of meat-consumption were named in connection to the health advantages of veganism and vegan alternative products. One article for example focused on the health benefits New Yorks’ mayor experienced after switching to a vegan diet. Before, his family and he himself had a history of type 2 Diabetes. After switching to a vegan diet, both him and his mother felt much better, and had no issues with the illness anymore (article 33). Multiple other articles point out, that vegans

¹ Translated into English by the author, as all following citations from the newspaper articles

often feel great, and that nutrient deficiency is usually not an issue on a well-balanced diet (articles 4, 12, 29, 43, 56). On the other side, one article also mentioned how especially fish can harm the body, by containing heavy metals, micro plastics and antibiotics.

On the other hand, people saw veganism as a threat. In this view, the consumption of meat, dairy and fish products is an essential part of western societies. Meat and dairy products are portrayed as tasty and essential for feeling good and missing out on these was even described as “culinary castration” by one author (article 41). Veganism is restrictive, as vegans have to cut out certain products. If this lifestyle is then forced onto everyone, individual freedoms are lost, because people are not allowed to choose whatever they want anymore. One article expressed this coercion as follows: “There is an enormous pressure put onto the consumer, partially from groups of [vegan] activists” (article 35). This pressure is put onto consumers against their will. Additionally, there was a fear of veganism attacking masculinity. In order to be a *proper* man, one has to eat meat, to become strong. Whoever does not eat meat does not have the strength and endurance it takes to be masculine, or as one article puts it: “Real men aren’t vegans” (article 10). Male vegans who following this logic lack this strength do not only face consequences for themselves, but drag the entirety of masculinity into the dirt with them. Because they are weak, they show this weak version of masculinity to the world, and masculinity as a whole will be perceived weaker. The last issue for this side was health disadvantages of both veganism and vegan alternative products. They framed the vegan diet as lacking nutrients, such as Vitamin B, protein, and iron. Those are either consumed naturally, with animal products, or with superficial supplements, that harm the body because they are not produced in nature. Vegan alternative products were seen as especially bad. Those can contain many additives. Some of these additives can be harmful to the human body (articles 16, 34). Further are they often high in sodium and fats, while not being nutritious (articles 23, 29). Consequently, in this view veganism and the alternatives that vegans choose are harmful to human health, both because of what unsafe substances they contain, and because of what necessary nutrients they lack.

Two articles argued that not the consumption of meat was the issue, but all consumption. Both articles focused on veganism being a form of consumption that was not exempt from moral flaws. If one is to see all consumption as bad, veganism – as consumption of plant products – is seen negatively as well. One of the articles pushed this point even further and argued that vegans have to usually worry less about the morality of their consumption. Following this logic, veganism is worse than meat-eating, as people consume with less bad conscience. As a result, veganism was seen as worse than other diets (article 45).

5.2 Causal interpretation

Vegans blamed cultural circumstances for the perpetually high consumption of meat. While in earlier centuries humans mainly ate meat after hunting it, nowadays people have become accustomed to eating meat (article 39). Additionally, as meat is seen as a status symbol at some point, is still important in our diet today, even though it would not have to be as prevalent (article 45). The lack of awareness of consumers for healthier and more sustainable options to their meat-focused diet was also seen as reason for the unwillingness of people to be accepting or more open towards a less meat-heavy diet.

On the other hand, vegans were blamed for trying to destroy this culture. It is seen as important part of everyday life, as well as an expression of wealth and status that this part of the world has generated over the course of the last century. This culture is under attack by vegans, who try to force their way of life and their lifestyle onto other parts of the society. This point of view feels that vegans are trying to force this restriction onto everyone. As such, vegans are seen as trying to change a world that does not require change.

5.3 Moral evaluation

I only found articles and opinions opposing veganism to be judging morally. Vegans were portrayed as green-left children of big-city elites, and generally caring about their own feelings and well-being more than about bigger societal issues (article 7). Their moral compass was their priority to make them feel good, while they neglected poorer parts of society and farmers who rely on animal agriculture to survive. One notion that was especially prevalent was that of the judgemental vegan. This came from vegans eating food that is considered ethically better, as there are no animals suffering at all for their diet. Because of that, many felt morally inferior for consuming animal products. They projected this feeling onto vegans, and saw vegans as judging them, even if that is potentially not the case (articles 12, 63).

Veganism was also seen as a religion. Vegans were framed as following a very strict ideology. This ideology cannot be reasoned or discussed with as they are sure of the arguments they had for becoming vegans and are not open for the disadvantages of veganism (articles 43, 50, 53, 54). One common word to describe vegans was “missionaries” (articles 4, 33, 39, 63). This follows the perception that vegans try to convince everybody around them to change their diet, even if the others clearly do not want to discuss diet and veganism. They try to spread their worldview even further, and one article described this process as “indoctrination” attempt (article 39), especially if it is done with children, or if they want to implement plant-based meals at public canteens (article 33).

In addition, vegans were characterized as extreme. The decision to turn vegan is seen as a drastic measure. Vegans are extremely strict with their diet. As mentioned above, in this sentiment veganism is seen as missing out on pleasures of life. Hence vegans have to force themselves really hard to continue this abstinence of animal products, prioritizing the well-being of animals and the environment over their own pleasure. They do not hesitate to take drastic and radical measures, to uncover animal suffering.

Seeing animal farming as torture was deemed an extreme comparison (article 41). Provoking others who do not follow their lifestyle with videos of animal slaughter and shouting sentences such as “Killing animals is murders” (article 39) was seen as part of veganism. Especially spectacular actions, for example against the use of fur in the fashion industry, have even become somewhat common (article 52). Only one article pointed out that while this group of extreme vegans is very present in the public, these radicals make up only a small portion of all vegans (article 53).

5.4 Treatment recommendation

Veganism was seen as the solution by vegans, as is obvious. Especially the environmental benefits of veganism and vegan alternative products were specified. This was referenced by counting the specific number of kilograms of CO₂ saved for each replacement of a meat-product with a vegan alternative (articles 21, 34, 45). The environmental benefits were named as reasons why people chose to become vegan (articles 3, 4). These benefits are mainly the sustainability and the CO₂-savings, as well as the lowered water expenditure. One focal point was that the attitude towards veganism should be changed, by informing and teaching differently about veganism. This does not necessarily include veganism becoming the only diet available, but people being more open-minded towards it. The consumption of meat should be seen in more negative ways, and as a result also go down as low as ninety percent from today’s level (article 11). Once people are aware of both the issues of meat-consumption as well as the fact that consuming less meat is an easy option, this should become the case (articles 44, 61). This should lead to a transition away from a culture obsessed with meat consumption. One thing that is expected to help in this transformation are vegan alternative products (article 31). They become more and more similar to their animal counterparts. While there are already widely available and well-known alternatives for beef and chicken, reports mentioned salmon, seafood, cheeses such as Camembert, eggs, and honey alternatives as very close to the original (articles 14, 21, 27, 31, 45, 50). These products will be helping in two ways. They will be available for vegans, to improve their variety in diet and make nicer options accessible. But additionally, they will help people slowly change their diet to more plant-based products.

The people fighting veganism, because it is a threat to culture, offered no solution. However, some alternative solutions to veganism were named by people opposing a full adoption of veganism as it was deemed the wrong option because it was too dramatic. Climate friendly solutions for food need to be created, no matter if the food contains animal products or not (article 51). While vegans choose a strict lifestyle, many people would be open for lowering their meat-consumption, for example through meatless days (article 5). Through their very limited and consequent lifestyle, vegans however scare others open for the idea of lowering their animal consumption away, drawing up opposition. A solution for this would be vegans choosing to promote their lifestyle less openly, to not draw too much opposition and attention towards them. Another important step in this regard would be a change in how agriculture is practiced in Western nations. In Germany this would also entail less animal farming and focusing

more on growing fruit and vegetables (article 51). Farmers here already profit from the boom of oat-milk, growing 15 percent more oats than ten years ago (article 48). Overall, it would focus on more sustainable forms of animal farming, namely ecological agriculture. For example, article 54 concentrated on cattle, and how they are essential at keeping grass plains healthy and thriving, providing necessary fertilizer for grass to flourish. As a result, those grass plains can act as CO₂-storage. Additionally, the dairy and meat production would not be the primary goal of the process, but rather a welcome side-effect. Making agriculture more compatible with sustainability goals and not prioritize profit over everything else would systematically change western agriculture towards a more ecological and animal-friendly sector.

Both sides called on politics to solve the issue in their favor. The pro-vegan side prioritized factory farming as an issue that could be solved by politics by implementing higher animal welfare standards and pushing towards ecological agriculture (articles 11, 49). They also demanded more public sources of information to create awareness about animal cruelty and the impacts of animal agriculture on the environment (article 44). Meat has a very low market-value at the moment, so farmers who sell their products cannot even afford better treatment of their animals. Both sides critiqued the system and wanted politicians to change it, in order to enable better living conditions for livestock (article 35). On the other side, farmers want more protection from animal rights activists that break into their barns to film their activities and point out harms to animals and publish the gathered information (article 49). Additional protection is needed to protect the cultural good of meat, so that cultural values and norms do not get lost. However, this is a role conservative politicians have already taken upon themselves (articles 6, 30).

The only neutral solution of this issue was in-vitro meat, sometimes also called cultured meat (articles 7, 45). This is a meat product grown in a lab from real animal cells. However, only a very small number of cells is needed to derive big outcomes. This product is not developed very far, and only allowed for human consumption in Singapore. The price is still high, and there is more research and innovation to market it properly. Once it becomes widely available, it would offer meat made of animal-cells, being very close to the original, while preventing the suffering and killing of animals.

5.5 Economic opportunity of vegan alternative products

Vegan alternative products were also portrayed neutrally, neither as problem nor solution, but just as niche products (articles 5, 16, 36), that are still not as popular as the animal original (articles 20, 25, 62). However, there is a huge rise in demand. Eventually, these products will absorb a decent share of the current market for animal products, and thereby take over parts of the animal sector (articles 1, 15, 38, 18, 50). The technology and innovation behind the products are becoming more and more advanced (articles 17, 50, 57). This technological progress makes more and more products possible. Additionally, over time production costs will diminish. Start-ups producing alternative products are marketed at high values, and big food companies seek out to take some of them over (articles 1, 17, 18). Given the high economic potential of vegan alternative products, the value of companies producing vegan alternatives

is expected to grow even further (articles 14, 29, 36). This was the only difference in frames in the newspapers, as this was focused a lot more in the *FAZ*, while the *SZ* did not focus on this aspect as much.

6. Discussion

This study aimed to show how veganism and vegans are portrayed (and thereby framed) in newspapers in Germany. The newspaper articles featured opinions from journalists, vegan activists, politicians, and people opposing veganism. Almost everyone agreed that the status quo is a problem, and that the current way of animal agriculture and factory farming is not sustainable in the long term. Especially the environmental impacts of these are having their stroll on the planet. The solutions to this differed widely.

On the one hand, vegans focused on a drastic reduction of overall meat consumption, as they framed suffering and slaughter of animals in animal agriculture as well as the health deficits that come along a meat-heavy diet as issues. Some vegans used faulty arguments for this reasoning, as pointed out by the other side. However, most of the frames mentioned in favor of veganism were based on scientific evidence. Vegans demanded higher awareness of the issues of animal rights, human health, and environmental aftereffects of animal farming. Politicians could implement awareness-raising campaigns, and schools could teach about these issues. Another way of fighting high meat consumption was the proposition of a meat-tax, resulting in higher meat prices. People would think more about what and when they consume meat, and alternative products would be a better option. The higher tax-income of the state could be given to the farmers to improve the conditions of the animals, i.e., by giving them more space. Right now, in Germany the sales tax is 19 percent. Staple foods are exempt from this, and only have a tax rate of 7 percent. Animal products count as staple foods, as they are essential nutritional elements in the diets of most German citizens. Vegan alternative products, such as plant-milk and meat alternatives, are taxed with the higher rate. This means that alternative products are systematically disadvantaged. Both the increase of tax for animal products or a decrease for alternatives might be a way of making alternatives more indulging for the consumer and decrease consumption of animal products. Another way of increasing the cost of animal products in Germany would be cutting down on funding for farmers. This solution seems unlikely though, as most of this funding for farms comes from the EU, and other member states are very protective of their agricultural sector.

On the other hand, arguments against veganism were more focused on culture. Meat-eating was seen as an integral part of our society, showing the economical advance that everyone can afford what once was a luxury good. The desire of people of lower classes to consume what once was unattainable is reasonable and justified, but meat has become such a normality nowadays, that the luxury has become the commodity. Extremely low meat prices have made meat widely available, and higher prices are now paid for quality, such as grass-fed animals, ecologically farmed meat products, and better cuts. Raising the price through increased taxes seems like the easy solution. Yet, this would disadvantage lower

income households disproportionately, as they already spend a higher percentage of their income on food. This social-justice frame hence sees decreasing the tax on plant-based alternatives as the better option. These alternatives would be available for more consumers and therefore increase their sales. The market share of vegan substitute products is already increasing today (e.g., article 1), and with this boost their sales might grow even quicker. The bigger the market is, the more options will become available. Producers will use and advance their existing technologies. Through innovation, economics of scale and competition the prices will decrease in the long run. Some vegan alternative products are healthy and nutritious, while others are not. One risk of the tax reduction is that highly processed and fatty meat alternatives become widely available, not improving the health of the public, but maybe even being a tremendous burden on people. As there are healthy options available, this is still better than continuing a meat-heavy diet, considering the health disadvantages of it

6.1 Polarization around identity

Veganism was seen as a complex issue. Identifying strongly with either veganism, or the opposition to it, makes it easier to be part of the debate, without having to entirely understand the nuanced varieties. Vegans identified strongly with the reasons why they chose to be vegan. The multiplicity of environmental, health, and moral reasons makes in their eyes a strong case for changing the own diet and lifestyle. Veganism is a form of individualization, as one makes a personal decision to become vegan (Jallinoja et al. 2020). However, vegans build a strong community, that helps each other, for example through vegan events or the mobile app *HappyCow*, that shows restaurants offering vegan foods in the surrounding. The support inside of the vegan community for one another aids the building of a common identity. Hatred shown towards vegans deepens the sense of community among vegans. They share the feeling of being insulted and threatened, both online and in person, which makes them feel more caring and protective of one another.

Some vegan groups have advocated strongly for a complete adoption of veganism, especially for animal welfare reasons (Cherry 2006). This makes up a small portion of vegans, while most vegans favor a reduction of meat consumption, as shown in part 5.4. Opposition of veganism focused on this fringe group of vegans, identifying themselves as protection of the public from these vegans that want to control individual consumption and behaviour. The community of vegans was framed using stereotypes, like being judgemental of others and coming from a rich background. The goal of this is to push vegans into a corner and to show everyone that vegans are not really liked. While the disapproval for vegans does not necessarily come from how they are framed in the news media, it is in fact the case that vegans rank among the least liked groups of western societies (MacInnis and Hodson 2015). Additionally, portraying vegans as an elite part of society that wants to change the way of life of other people pushes the frame of the vegan agenda. As laid out earlier, is this a conspiracy by some advocates against veganism. Blame and guilt for those who eat meat are an essential part of this frame. Meat-eaters are shamed for their consumption, by people who feel morally superior. As such, vegans are the enemy of

everybody who does not strictly follow their diet. Pushing vegans into this extreme corner helps to generate an “*us vs. them*”-feeling (Sievert et al. 2021). Whoever wants to continue eating meat, even if at reduced quantities, can sympathize more with people who want to keep consumption an individual choice, and not a generally mandated one. This frames vegans as an attack on free choice and tries to garner support of people that did not care for this conflict before. This means, that the debate becomes more value driven. Vegans focus on their values of environmental protection and animal welfare. Their opponents focus on a protection of culture and the defence of their free choice. This stark polarization is intended to pull people away from a more nuanced and neutral position towards either of the two camps. Bridging the gap between values that are seen as essential on both sides becomes more and more difficult.

This clash was framed as problematic by people taking a more neutral stance. There is a need for differentiating people who focus on protecting individual consumer choice. This was done by people opposing veganism. But there was also a group of people who were neutral towards veganism, and accepted others around them being vegan, accepting the free choice of vegans to select any diet (article 26). The clash between the two groups was emotional (articles 2, 43). This divide was seen as the issue, but there was no real solution how a value-focused clash could be resolved. Hence, they did not judge vegans and saw the change of consumption as a natural developing pattern. The implications of changing consumer demand are discussed in the next part.

6.2 Veganism as a market opportunity

Veganism has established itself as a diet in western society, being widely accepted by others, except for those who oppose it strongly. Many people who are not strictly vegan still adopt some vegan behaviours, especially when they are around vegans, i.e., family members, partners or cohabitants (Parkinson et al. 2019). As a result, they sometimes use vegan alternative products instead of their animal originals, because they have tried them out and grown accustomed to them. As explained earlier is this way of reducing the consumption of animal products called flexitarianism. Vegan alternative products were framed as an economical investment opportunity, not only because of the growing number of vegans, but because of the huge mostly untapped market of flexitarians that are eager to consume some vegan alternative products. Big food producing companies are seeing this and try to offer vegan options. A perfect example for this is the German company *Rügenwalder Mühle*. Originally, they are a producer of meat products, such as sausages and ham. They started to offer vegan and vegetarian alternatives for their meat products. Especially their vegan options are in such high demand, that the company made more revenue from their alternative section than from their meat products (articles 36, 46). Big companies search for the biggest profit that they can make. As consumers show their interest in vegan alternatives, this market becomes more and more relevant for food companies. Vegans and non-vegans that want to reduce their meat and dairy consumption can buy vegan alternative products, to show their support of this growing sector, while also showing that they are less interested in animal products.

7. Conclusion

The goal of this thesis was to show how veganism and vegans are framed. The biggest limitation of the study is quite obvious. The analysis was purely qualitative, and the coding was conducted by a single coder. In the setting of this thesis, increasing coding reliability by doing an intercoder reliability check was not possible, as I was working alone. The objects of analysis were newspaper articles from two German news outlets. This choice tried to cover a wide array of political opinions, while keeping the number of articles at a reasonable level. However, further research could focus on different newspapers, as well as other countries, to gain further insights into how this topic is framed, especially outside industrialized nations. The manual holistic approach was used, to inductively analyze the data. Further analysis can also quantify the presence of frames and frame elements, using deductive computer-assisted methodologies. The findings show that veganism is established in the German society. However, there is a clash between vegans and people who strongly oppose veganism. Veganism can be seen as the solution to the problems of the climate crisis, human health, and animal welfare. On the other hand, it can be seen as a threat to cultural values, feeling that one has earned to eat meat and experiencing the pleasure of good foods that contain animal products. Despite some rejection, vegan alternative products are rising in popularity, and food producers see this demand and react by creating vegan options. Framing veganism can have an impact on how vegans are perceived by others. Bridging the gap between vegans and opponents of veganism can be one of the tasks of framing veganism in the future. As veganism is here to stay, so are its adversaries, and bringing them closer together might prevent further hatred and clashes between the two groups.

References

- Adams, M. (2022): Communicating Vegan Utopias: The Counterfactual Construction of Human-animal Futures. In *Environmental Communication* 16 (1), pp. 125–138. DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2021.1969977.
- Atanasova, D. (2019): Moving Society to a Sustainable Future. The Framing of Sustainability in a Constructive Media Outlet. In *Environmental Communication* 13 (5), pp. 700–711. DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2019.1583262.
- Bouvard, V.; Loomis, D.; Guyton, K.; Grosse, Y.; El Ghissassi, F.; Benbrahim-Tallaa, L. et al. (2015): Carcinogenicity of consumption of red and processed meat. In *The Lancet Oncology* 16 (16), pp. 1599–1600. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00444-1.
- Bundesvereinigung der Deutschen Ernährungsindustrie (2021): How does the future taste? Sustainability trends in the food and drink industries 2021.
- Bye, Z.; Keshavarz, P.; Lane, G.; Vatanparast, H. (2021): What Role Do Plant-Based Diets Play in Supporting the Optimal Health and Well-being of Canadians? A Scoping Review. In *Adv Nutr* 12 (6), pp. 2132–2146. DOI: 10.1093/advances/nmab061.
- Cherry, E. (2006): Veganism as a Cultural Movement: A Relational Approach. In *Social Movement Studies* 5 (2), pp. 155–170. DOI: 10.1080/14742830600807543.
- Dewulf, A.; Gray, B.; Putnam, L.; Lewicki, R.; Aarts, N.; Bouwen, R.; van Woerkum, C. (2009): Disentangling approaches to framing in conflict and negotiation research: A meta-paradigmatic perspective. In *Human Relations* 62 (2), pp. 155–193. DOI: 10.1177/0018726708100356.
- Domingo, J.; Nadal, M. (2017): Carcinogenicity of consumption of red meat and processed meat: A review of scientific news since the IARC decision. In *Food and Chemical Toxicology* 105, pp. 256–261. DOI: 10.1016/j.fct.2017.04.028.
- Entman, R. (1991): Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents. In *J Commun* 41 (4), pp. 6–27. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1991.tb02328.x.
- Entman, R. (1993): Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. In *Journal of Communication* 43 (4), pp. 51–58.
- Fadnes, L.; Økland, J.; Haaland, Ø.; Johansson, K. (2022): Estimating impact of food choices on life expectancy: A modeling study. In *PLoS medicine* 19 (2). DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003889.
- Fischer, F. (2003): Reframing public policy. Discursive politics and deliberative practices. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Gamson, W.; Modigliani, A. (1989): Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach. In *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1), pp. 1–37. DOI: 10.1086/229213.
- Goffman, E. (1974): Frame analysis. An essay on the organization of experience. Boston. Available online at https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1975-09476-000?source=post_elevate_sequence_page-----.
- Grünhage, T.; Reuter, M. (2021): What Makes Diets Political? Moral Foundations and the Left-Wing-Vegan Connection. In *Soc Just Res* 34 (1), pp. 18–52. DOI: 10.1007/s11211-020-00361-w.
- Jallinoja, P.; Vinnari, M.; Niva, M. (2020): Veganism and plant-based eating: Analysis of interplay between discursive strategies and lifestyle political consumerism. In *The Oxford handbook of Political Consumerism*. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190629038.01.

Janssen, M.; Busch, C.; Rödiger, M.; Hamm, U. (2016): Motives of consumers following a vegan diet and their attitudes towards animal agriculture. In *Appetite* 105, pp. 643–651. DOI: 10.1016/j.appet.2016.06.039.

Kerschke-Risch, P. (2015): Vegan diet: Motives, approach and duration. Initial results of a quantitative sociological study. In *Ernaehrungs Umschau international* (6). DOI: 10.4455/eu.2015.016.

Kühne, K. (2011): Mitbestimmung und Massenmedien. Zeitungen als politische Akteure im deutschen Mitbestimmungsdiskurs. In *Industrielle Beziehungen / The German Journal of Industrial Relations* 18 (4), pp. 241–261. Available online at https://www.jstor.org/stable/23279692?casa_token=bynst0uvpqmaaaaa:m9mof47axbxzeyt5zyybiz605spbghvshubxonrdn6fnrfe4w2qyzatzxlxz5yn0mtxrbavseofmrpoachzouc-kqrsm0h8qs2w8uqlgas6zqyybog.

MacInnis, C.; Hodson, G. (2015): It ain't easy eating greens: Evidence of bias toward vegetarians and vegans from both source and target. In *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 20 (6), pp. 721–744. DOI: 10.1177/1368430215618253.

Matthes, J.; Kohring, M. (2008): The Content Analysis of Media Frames: Toward Improving Reliability and Validity. In *Journal of Communication* 58 (2), pp. 258–279. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00384.x.

Mittal, R.; Brüggemann, M. (2019): Eating for the future. Elite media framing of sustainable food choices. In *Sustainable Lives: Food Choices as Politics and Lifestyle*. Available online at <http://bruegge.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/eating-for-the-future.pdf>.

Mizumoto, K.; Kagaya, K.; Chowell, G. (2020): Effect of a wet market on coronavirus disease (COVID-19) transmission dynamics in China, 2019-2020. In *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases* 97, pp. 96–101. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.091.

Parkinson, C.; Twine, R.; Griffin, N. (2019): Pathways to Veganism: Exploring Effective Messages in Vegan Transition. Available online at <https://research.edgehill.ac.uk/en/publications/pathways-to-veganism-exploring-effective-messages-in-vegan-transi>.

Phillips, R. (2019): Frames as Boundaries: Rhetorical Framing Analysis and the Confines of Public Discourse in Online News Coverage of Vegan Parenting. In *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 43 (2), pp. 152–170. DOI: 10.1177/0196859918814821.

Scarborough, Peter; Appleby, Paul N.; Mizdrak, Anja; Briggs, Adam D. M.; Travis, Ruth C.; Bradbury, Kathryn E.; Key, Timothy J. (2014): Dietary greenhouse gas emissions of meat-eaters, fish-eaters, vegetarians and vegans in the UK. In *Climatic change* 125 (2), pp. 179–192. DOI: 10.1007/s10584-014-1169-1.

Scheufele, D. (1999): Framing as a theory of media effects. In *Journal of Communication* 49 (1), pp. 103–122. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x.

Sievert, K.; Lawrence, M.; Parker, C.; Russell, C.; Baker, P. (2021): Who has a beef with reducing red and processed meat consumption? A media framing analysis. In *Public Health Nutr.* 25 (3), pp. 578–590. DOI: 10.1017/s1368980021004092.

Snow, D.; Benford, R. (1988): Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. In *International Social Movement Research* 1, pp. 197–217. Available online at <https://scholar.google.nl/citations?user=1tnyq7maaaaj&hl=de&inst=5726176096060060532&oi=sra>.

The Vegan Society (2022). Available online at <https://www.vegansociety.com/go-vegan/definition-veganism>, checked on last access: 6/21/2022.

Twine, R. (2017): A practice theory framework for understanding vegan transition. In *Animal Studies Journal* 6 (2), pp. 192–224. Available online at <https://ro.uow.edu.au/asj/vol6/iss2/12/>.

van Gorp, B.: Strategies to Take Subjectivity out of Framing Analysis.

van Hulst, M.; Yanow, D. (2016): From Policy “Frames” to “Framing”. Theorizing a More Dynamic, Political Approach. In *The American Review of Public Administration* 46 (1), pp. 92–112. DOI: 10.1177/0275074014533142.

Walter, D.; Ophir, Y. (2019): News Frame Analysis: An Inductive Mixed-method Computational Approach. In *Communication Methods and Measures* 13 (4), pp. 248–266. DOI: 10.1080/19312458.2019.1639145.

Appendices

Appendix A: Codebook

Code		Description (if necessary)	Frequency	Frame Elements
All consumption is bad		Every kind of consumption is bad, no matter if vegan or animal products.	5	Problem
Call for action of politics		Politics should step in and act. This action is not specified (yet).	9	Solution
Clash between Vegans and consumers of animal products		Vegans and the consumers of animal products clash. It is an emotionally charged battle between cultures, worldviews, genders and lifestyle.	25	Problem
Complex issue		The conflict between veganism and animal consumption is highly complex and nuanced. There is no real winner, and the whole topic is even controversially debated in science.	2	Problem
Getting to know veganism through trying it out.		People are maybe not convinced by veganism, but they try to follow the lifestyle for a limited amount of time and show general curiosity for the topic. They do not necessarily have to end up following a vegan diet, but they do not oppose it in all its parts. They might even adopt some vegan tendencies.	6	
\$ Health disadvantage			21	Problem
	_ health disadvantage of vegan alternative products	Vegan products can contain different additives, that are harmful. They are highly processed foods, that do not carry the nutritional value of animal products.	17	Problem
	_ health disadvantage of veganism	Veganism as diet that lacks nutrients, such as Vitamin B, protein and iron.	4	Problem
	* Health disadvantage of animal products	Animal products can contain bad substances, such as plastics and heavy metals.	1	Problem
Vegan diet established and accepted in society		A vegan diet has become established and accepted in western society. People know others who follow this diet and are familiar with it. They have tried vegan (alternative) products and tend to like at least some of them.	34	

_ Biological Reasons for Animal Consumption		The consumption of animal products normal, because the humans are at the top of the food chain. The keeping of animals is necessary to ensure agriculture. The killing of animals is natural, because they would die in the wild anyways.	12	Cause
_ complexity of veganism		Veganism is very complicated, and it can be easy that you miss crucial nutrients in your diet. Additionally, the amount of research and preparation, plus the work that goes into veganism cannot be done by everyone.	6	Problem
_ Incorrect reasons for veganism		The facts why many people choose to become vegan and try to convince others to become vegan, are false. Wrong data is used, and the arguments are confused and bad. Proofs of benefits of veganism are wrong.	6	Cause
_ Opposition to veganism		Veganism is a threat to society. There is a fight against veganism, that can be extreme.	8	Moral Judgement
_ Stereotypes about Veganism		Vegans are portrayed as Hippies, hillbillies and woke lefties, that care more about their own feelings and wellbeing than societal issues.	11	Moral Judgement
_ Threat			37	
	_ Vegan Agenda	Veganism as trend of the powerful secret elite, that wants to make certain foods only available for the rich. The common people will suffer if the elite gets their will, aka everyone becoming vegan. Conspiratorial	4	Cause
	_ Veganism against culture	Veganism is an attack on western industrialized culture. Eating meat is an essential part of this culture.	9	Cause
	_ Veganism against masculinity	Veganism is a threat to masculinity. Eating meat is seen as strong, masculine activity, that will be take away	3	Problem, Cause
	_ Veganism as compulsion	Vegans try to force their diet and lifestyle onto others. Veganism is a lifestyle that does restrict the individual freedom of people. The individual freedom and choice is to be suppressed to enforce a vegan lifestyle for everybody.	11	Problem, Cause
	_ Veganism as sacrifice	A vegan diet and lifestyle misses out on many convenient and tasty items. Vegans do not have everything it takes to live a happy life.	9	Cause

	_ Veganism not animal protection	Veganism is not animal protection. The gift of life is far greater for animals than being killed for their products.	9	Cause
	_ Veganism as religion	Vegans are portrayed as followers of a religion, that are missionaries and try to convince everyone they see to follow this religion too. Their ideology is beyond disagreement and discussion.	12	Moral Judgement
	_ Vegans feeling morally superior	Vegans think their choice of consumption is morally better. Thus, they judge others who do not follow their way of life.	12	Moral Judgement
	_Vegan: Extremism	Vegans and veganism are extreme measure. Vegans are radical, very strict with their diet, and do not accept outside opinions. They sometimes commit crimes to hurt the animal industry.	25	Moral Judgement
	_veganism: wrong solution	Veganism is the wrong solution for the problems and causes that vegans choose to justify their diet. No further solution is given.	11	Solution
	* Accuracy of vegan alternative products		9	Solution
	* Demand for rethinking	The issue has to be thought about differently, people need to change their view of veganism.	6	Solution
	* Health advantage		19	Problem
	* Health advantage of vegan alternative products	Not every vegan alternative product is harmful, there are many that do not contain the fat and calories of animal products.	5	Problem
	* Health advantage of veganism	Veganism is possible without any nutritional deficiency. Consumption of less calories, while nutrients can be substituted easily with other foods.	14	Problem
	* Transition of world as result of veganism	Veganism transforms the world. This has many advantages.	4	Solution
	* veganism is uncomplicated	Veganism can be done easily	10	
	* veganism: animal protection	Veganism protects animals. By not consuming animal products, animal farming is rejected.	17	Solution
	Environmental benefits		29	Solution
	* of vegan alternative products		15	Solution
	* of veganism		17	Solution

Environmental harms			31	Problem
	_ of vegan alternative products		8	Problem
	* of animal products/farming		24	Problem
Free choice		Everyone should be able to make free decisions about what kind of products they consume, and what diet they follow. Veganism can be an option, but not a compulsory one.	17	Solution
Hatred			9	Problem
	* Hatred: towards producers of vegan alternative products	The producers of vegan alternative products face shitstorms and furor for producing these products.	5	Problem
	* Hatred: towards vegans	Vegans face hatred, insults and other extreme individual actions against them.	6	Problem
Solution			15	Solution
	In-vitro Meat		3	Solution
	_ Change of agriculture		7	Solution
	_ Reduction of animal consumption instead of veganism	Instead of veganism, consumers should just reduce their consumption of animal products.	5	Solution
Vegan alternative products			101	
	\$ High (economic) potential	Vegan alternative products are in high demand, and the market is expected to grow in the upcoming years.	18	
	\$ Investment opportunity		22	
	niche products		2	
	Not as popular as animal original		9	

	\$ Rise of demand	The demand for vegan alternative products has been as is projected to be rising. These products will eventually take up a decent share of the market of animal products and substitute them.	24	
	\$ Technology and innovation	Vegan alternative products are only possible through new technologies and innovations. New ways of how these products are created. Consumers do also have to pay for the know-how of this production innovation, as vegan alternative products usually take long to be created, and then still are improved further.	15	
	_ Bad in taste		2	Problem
	_ Copy of original		6	Problem
	_ Deception of consumer		6	Problem
	_ Expensive		10	Problem
	* Good in taste		4	Problem
	* New possibilities	Vegan alternative products have a unexplored, untouched arket in front of them. By creating new products with new ingredients they can sell nwe products.	7	Problem
	* shelf life advantage	Vegan food is more shelf stable than animal products.	1	Problem
Vegan: (Trend of the) Future		Veganism is becoming more and more established. In the following years, the number of vegans and people who consume vegan alternative products is expected to grow. Veganism is already a trend, but it will become bigger.	20	
Veganism as Trend		Veganism is an up and coming trend.	16	
	Trend of Education	More educated people tend to follow a vegan diet/lifestyle.	2	
	Trend of Women	The gneder divide between men and women is big. More women follow a vegan diet/lifestyle.	5	
	Trend of young people	More young people tend to follow a vegan diet/lifestyle.	11	

Appendix B: List of Articles

Article Number	Name	Author	Date	Word Count	News-paper
1	Mit Kunstfleisch gegen die Corona-Krise	Christoph Scherbaum	08.05.2020	929	FAZ
2	Kein Fressen ohne Moral	Julia Bähr	10.05.2020	1365	FAZ
3	Anfangen statt abwehren	Carlotta Thiel	30.08.2020	670	FAZ
4	"Ich bin kein Missionar"	Lale Artun	12.09.2020	769	FAZ
5	Essen kommt wieder aus der Küche	Georg Giersberg	30.09.2020	695	FAZ
6	Von Veggie-Würstchen zu "Veggie-Stangen"?	Stefanie Diemand, Svea Junge, Hendrik Kafsack	18.10.2020	1141	FAZ
7	Vegane Erbsenklopse machen nicht glücklich	Rainer Hank	31.10.2020	1064	FAZ
8	Kann man vegan und deftig kochen?	Kais Harrabi	13.11.2020	830	FAZ
9	Auf das blaue Wasser kommt es an	Stefanie Diemand	11.12.2020	697	FAZ
10	"Die Vorstellung, dass Männer Steak und Frauen Salat mögen, ist noch relativ jung"	Leonie Feuerbach	01.01.2021	1439	FAZ
11	Jung, weiblich, vegetarisch	Julia Löhr	06.01.2021	733	FAZ
12	Jetzt geht's an die Wurst!	Freya Altmüller	06.02.2021	1891	FAZ
13	Muss vegane Ernährung teuer sein?	Julia Anton	09.02.2021	812	FAZ
14	Thunfisch ohne Fisch	Johannes Ritter	23.03.2021	855	FAZ
15	Produktion von Fleischersatzprodukten steigt 2020 um mehr als ein Drittel	-	14.05.2021	329	FAZ
16	Doppelt so viele Vegetarier	Stefanie Diemand, Svea Junge, Julia Löhr	19.05.2021	972	FAZ
17	Der Aufstieg der Erbse	Sebastian Balzter	19.05.2021	1744	FAZ
18	Pflanzliches Kraftfutter für die Börse	Madeleine Brühl	26.05.2021	1383	FAZ
19	"In Burgern steckt viel Technologie"	Roland Lindner	26.07.2021	1176	FAZ
20	Auf der Suche nach Schnitzel und Currywurst	Kilian Schroeder	27.08.2021	723	FAZ
21	Kann das schmecken, veganes Ei?	Lilly Bittner	15.09.2021	282	FAZ
22	Ich bin so frei	Boris Schmidt	18.09.2021	872	FAZ
23	Veganes Sakrileg	Peter Badenhop	13.10.2021	396	FAZ
24	Pflanzliches für die Börse	Stefanie Diemand	13.10.2021	670	FAZ
25	"Wer kochen kann, kann auch vegan kochen"	Marilena Piesker	22.10.2021	952	FAZ

26	Auch Christdemokraten und Liberale mögen Vegetarisches	Bernhard Biener	30.10.2021	580	FAZ
27	Räucherlachs für Investoren	Daniel Mohr	01.11.2021	1208	FAZ
28	Die Kuh lernt besser rülpsen	Winand von Petersdorff	02.11.2021	1228	FAZ
29	Wie gesund sind Fleischersatzprodukte?	Svea Junge	08.11.2021	1112	FAZ
30	Kalt erwischt mit veganen Burgern	Roland Lindner	13.11.2021	1106	FAZ
31	Die Lachs-Alternative aus dem 3-D-Drucker	Michaela Seiser	01.01.2022	1395	FAZ
32	Immer wieder Veganuary	Stefanie Diemand	08.01.2022	928	FAZ
33	Warum New Yorks neuer Bürgermeister auf vegane Ernährung setzt	Sofia Dreisbach	11.01.2022	1789	FAZ
34	Die Spitzengastronomie gibt's jetzt auch in vegan	Johannes Ritter	09.02.2022	1135	FAZ
35	"Eine Kuh können Sie nicht auspressen wie eine Zitrone"	Stefanie Diemand, Svea Junge	16.02.2022	2080	FAZ
36	"Die vegane Currywurst ist sehr beliebt"	Julia Stelzner	10.04.2022	674	FAZ
37	Wenn Veganer Feste feiern	Joachim Müller-Jung	12.04.2022	429	FAZ
38	Wie schmeckt veganes Ei aus Ackerbohnen?	Daniel Mohr	16.04.2022	944	FAZ
39	Der Metzger und der Missionar	Johannes Pennekamp	21.04.2022	2079	FAZ
40	"Hafermilch ist keine Lösung"	Sebastian Balzter	25.04.2022	1808	FAZ
41	Die Knechtschaft in der Gemüsediktatur	Jakob Strobel y Serra	27.04.2022	669	FAZ
42	"Die eine Nichtveganerin hat leider schnell abgebrochen"	Bernd Kramer	10.08.2020	467	SZ
43	Brauchen Kinder Fleisch?	Kerstin Lottritz	24.11.2020	955	SZ
44	Weniger Lust auf Fleisch	Silvia Liebrich	06.01.2021	537	SZ
45	Die große Verheißung	Michael Moorstedt	04.02.2021	1816	SZ
46	Fisch vom Acker, Fleisch aus dem Bioreaktor	Silvia Liebrich	24.03.2021	675	SZ
47	Wie das Auto vegan wird	Haiko Prengel	05.05.2021	975	SZ
48	Pferdefutter, das Investoren träumen lässt	Silvia Liebrich	20.05.2021	803	SZ
49	Undercover im Stall	Thomas Hummel	12.06.2021	2076	SZ
50	Neues aus Emmental	Titus Arnu	03.07.2021	1344	SZ
51	Mandelmilch ist nicht so ökologisch, wie viele denken	Silvia Liebrich	02.09.2021	985	SZ
52	Was Affen auf die Palme bringt	David Pfeifer	05.11.2021	1529	SZ
53	"Dass vegane Ernährung krank macht, ist ein großer Quatsch"	Michael Kläsgen, Silvie Liebrich	15.11.2021	1588	SZ

54	Das Tier in dir	Werner Bartens	23.12.2021	1887	SZ
55	Haus, Auto, Nackensteak	Gerhard Matzig	28.12.2021	1248	SZ
56	Geht auch ohne Fleisch	Verena Mayer	15.01.2022	1402	SZ
57	Hafermilch selbst herstellen	Fabienne Hurst	05.02.2022	1690	SZ
58	Ein Brennglas für alle Krisen	Kristina Remmert	24.03.2022	1081	SZ
59	Vegane Auszeit in Bad Tölz	Claudia Koestler	18.04.2022	571	SZ
60	Rettet Steakessen die Welt	Linus Freymark	20.04.2022	725	SZ
61	Wer Tiere liebt, sollte sie essen	Christina Berndt	23.04.2022	2150	SZ
62	Es geht um die Wurst	Roman Deininger	29.04.2022	1583	SZ
63	"Ein oralsadistischer Akt"	Mortz Geier	20.06.2220	1152	SZ