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ABSTRACT

The dataset provided with this article is related to “Lowering Barriers to Plant-based Diets: The Effect of Human and Non-Human Animal Self-Similarity on Meat Avoidance Intent and Sensory Food Satisfaction” [1]. The connection between compassion and adherence to plant-based diets is intuitive. The first dataset is a sample of 372 participants in the United States that was collected online. Trait compassion, measured using the Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale [2], is positively associated with intent to avoid dietary meat consumption. The second set of data, collected online from 131 participants in the United States, provides evidence for the underlying psychological process: the relationship between trait compassion and meat avoidance intent is serially mediated by perceived similarity to other human animals and non-human animals. Similarity scores were measured inversely as perceived distance using heat-map type questionnaire items based on inclusion-of-other-in-the-self (IOS, [3]) and relational closeness scales [4]. Demographic information, physical characteristics, and measurement of athletic identity are provided [5]. These data can be used in psychology research on food studies specifically and to glean more insight on human’s connection with other animals in general [6,7]. The supplementary data on participants’ physical characteristics such as BMI, combined with measurement of athletic identity, can inform sports and nutrition science.
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### Specifications Table

| Subject                        | Social and Personality Psychology |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Specific subject area         | Psychology of Meat Consumption    |
| Type of data                  | Table                             |
| How data were acquired        | Participants filled out an electronic survey using the Qualtrics platform. Survey print-outs are provided. |
| Data format                   | Raw                               |
| Parameters for data collection| Participants were pre-screened by Prolific Academic for residence in the United States. Data are provided from participants who finished the entire survey. |
| Description of data collection| Data were collected online using Prolific Academic. |
| Data source location          | Participants indicated residence in the United States. |
| Data accessibility            | Repository name: Mendeley Data     |
|                               | Data identification number: 10.17632/xjcf662svc.1 |
|                               | Direct URL to data: https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/xjcf662svc/draft?a=4f4eda09-9196-4003-a11d-b2aaac64bdef |

**Related research article**

Pohlmann, A. (2021). Lowering barriers to plant-based diets: The effect of human and non-human animal self-similarity on meat avoidance intent and sensory food satisfaction. Food Quality and Preference, 93, 104,272.

### Value of the Data

- The data provide support for the intransigence of the moral self-concept; regulating compassion forces trade-offs in the moral self-concept. In the consumer-relevant context of food consumption, lower capacity for compassion for conspecifics is associated with moral compromises in food choices, i.e. lower meat avoidance intent, which has implications for individual and environmental health.
- Who benefits Marketing and consumer behavior researchers, social psychology, citizen scientists, replication studies.
- Demographic information (sex, age, family status), physical characteristics (height, weight, BMI), and supplementary information provided by the sub-scale items of psychological measures, such as athletic identity. They can be used to develop experiments in sports, health, and nutrition science.

### 1. Data Description

Dataset 1 provides data on the association between trait compassion and meat avoidance intent. Variable names, descriptions, scale items, coding schemes, as well as variable means (M) and standard deviations (SD) are provided in Table 1.

Dataset 2 provides data on the mediating role of human animal self-similarity and non-human animal self-similarity between trait compassion and meat avoidance intent. Variable names, descriptions, scale items, coding schemes, as well as variable means (M) and standard deviations (SD) are provided in Table 2.

Each set is accompanied by a print-out of the Qualtrics survey that was used to collect data.
Table 1
List of variables and descriptive statistics for dataset 1.

| Variable   | Description                                      | Scale                                                                 | M   | SD  |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| BIOSEX     | Biological sex                                   | 0 = female, 1 = male                                                  | .67 | .47 |
| AGE        | Age in years                                      | 18–71                                                                 | 33  | 11.61 |
| FAMSTAT    | Family status                                     | 1 = single, never married, 2 = married without children, 3 = married with children, 4 = divorced, 5 = separated, 6 = widowed, 7 = living with partner | n/a |     |
| SCBCS_1    | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 1       | When I hear about someone (a stranger) going through a difficult time, I feel a great deal of compassion. 1 = not at all true of me, 5 = very true of me | 3.70 | .96 |
| SCBCS_2    | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 2       | Tend to feel compassion for people, even though I do not know them. | 3.65 | 1.04 |
| SCBCS_3    | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 3       | One of the activities that provide me with the most meaning to my life is helping others in the world when they need help. | 3.52 | 1.04 |
| SCBCS_4    | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 4       | I would rather engage in actions that help others, even though they are strangers, than engage in actions that would help me. | 3.27 | 1.04 |
| SCBCS_5    | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 5       | I often have tender feelings toward people (strangers) when the seem to be in need. | 3.62 | .99 |
| SCBCS_6    | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 6       | It is easy for me to experience the pain (and joy) experienced by others. | 3.62 | 1.01 |
| MAL_1      | Meat Avoidance Intent, Item 1                    | I avoid eating red meat. 0 = no, 1 = yes                              | .19 | .39 |
| MAL_2      | Meat Avoidance Intent, Item 2                    | I avoid eating meat: any animal flesh, e.g. beef, pork, seafood, chicken, etc. | .08 | .28 |
| MAL_3      | Meat Avoidance Intent, Item 3                    | I avoid eating any product that comes from an animal.                | .03 | .17 |
| HEIGHT_IMP | Participant height, Imperial                      | How tall are you in feet ‘inches’?                                   | 5.8 | .36 |
| HEIGHT_CM  | Participant height, Metric                       | Height converted to centimeters.                                     | 171.14 | 11.18 |
| WEIGHT_LBS | Participant weight, LBS                          | How much do you weigh in pounds?                                     | 172.90 | 46.00 |
| WEIGHT_KG  | Participant weight, Kg                           | Weight converted to kilograms.                                       | 78.42 | 20.87 |
| BMI        | Body Mass Index                                   | Body Mass Index                                                      | 26.69 | 6.28 |
| ATHLID_1   | Athletic Identity, Item 1                         | I exercise regularly. 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree      | 3.42 | 1.14 |
| ATHLID_2   | Athletic Identity, Item 2                         | Sport is an important part of my life.                               | 2.81 | 1.27 |
| ATHLID_3   | Athletic Identity, Item 3                         | Other people consider me as athletic.                                | 2.72 | 1.25 |
| ATHLID_4   | Athletic Identity, Item 4                         | My participation in sport is a very positive part of my life.        | 2.86 | 1.29 |
| SCBCS_AVG  | Calculated                                        | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, average of 6 items.              | 3.56 | .82 |
| MAL_SUM    | Calculated                                        | Meat Avoidance Intent, sum of 3 items.                              | .30  | .67 |
| ATHLID_AVG | Calculated                                        | Athletic Identity, average of 4 items.                               | 2.95 | 1.09 |

Each set includes an SPSS script that was used to calculate combined variables and perform the analysis.

Datasets are provided in SPSS .sav format and as comma-separated .csv.

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

To collect the data provided in the first dataset, 372 participants (124 female) were recruited using Prolific Academic and filled out an online survey using the Qualtrics platform. Trait
### Table 2

List of variables and descriptive statistics for dataset 2.

| Variable     | Description                                                                 | Scale Item and Scoring | M   | SD  |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-----|
| BIOSEX       | Biological sex                                                              | 0 = female, 1 = male    | .58 | .50 |
| AGE          | Age in years                                                                 | 18–47                   | 22  | 3.76|
| SCBCS_1      | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 1                                  | When I hear about someone (a stranger) going through a difficult time, I feel a great deal of compassion. 1 = not at all true of me, 5 = very true of me | 3.47 | 1.04 |
| SCBCS_2      | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 2                                  | I tend to feel compassion for people, even though I do not know them. | 3.51 | 1.05 |
| SCBCS_3      | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 3                                  | One of the activities that provide me with the most meaning to my life is helping others in the world when they need help. | 3.45 | 1.15 |
| SCBCS_4      | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 4                                  | I would rather engage in actions that help others, even though they are strangers, than engage in actions that would help me. | 3.11 | 1.11 |
| SCBCS_5      | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, Item 5                                  | I often have tender feelings toward people (strangers) when they seem to be in need. | 3.43 | .99 |
| DIST_HUMAN   | Combined distance score human animal self-similarity                        | Measured using heat-map type questionnaire with 3 trials. Range: 0–282 pixels. Reported DIST_HUMAN score is averaged and divided by 100 to adjust to the scale of other variables in model. | .41  | .51 |
| DIST_ANIMAL  | Combined distance score non-human animal self-similarity                    | Measured using heat-map type questionnaire with 3 trials. Range: 0–282 pixels. Reported DIST_ANIMAL score is averaged and divided by 100 to adjust to the scale of other variables in model. | 1.05 | .61 |
| MAL_1        | Meat Avoidance Intent, Item 1                                               | I avoid eating red meat. 0 = no, 1 = yes | .22  | .42 |
| MAL_2        | Meat Avoidance Intent, Item 2                                               | I avoid eating meat: any animal flesh, e.g. beef, pork, seafood, chicken, etc. | .13  | .34 |
| MAL_3        | Meat Avoidance Intent, Item 3                                               | I avoid eating any product that comes from an animal. | .03  | .17 |
| HEIGHT_IMP   | Participant height                                                          | How tall are you in feet ‘inches? | 5.6  | .32 |
| HEIGHT_CM    | Participant height, Metric                                                  | Height converted to centimeters. | 166.68 | 9.26 |
| WEIGHT_LBS   | Participant weight                                                          | How much do you weigh in pounds? | 130.01 | 26.93 |
| WEIGHT_KG    | Participant weight, Kg                                                      | Weight converted to kilograms. | 58.99 | 12.22 |
| BMI          | Body Mass Index                                                             | Body Mass Index           | 21.19 | 3.95 |
| ATHLID_1     | Athletic Identity, Item 1                                                   | I exercise regularly. 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree | 3.48 | 1.28 |
| ATHLID_2     | Athletic Identity, Item 2                                                   | Sport is an important part of my life. | 3.80 | 1.23 |
| ATHLID_3     | Athletic Identity, Item 3                                                   | Other people consider me as athletic. | 3.09 | 1.33 |
| ATHLID_4     | Athletic Identity, Item 4                                                   | My participation in sport is a very positive part of my life. | 3.72 | 1.28 |
| SCBCS_AVG    | Calculated                                                                  | Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale, average of 6 items. | 3.39 | .86 |
| MAL_SUM      | Calculated                                                                  | Meat Avoidance Intent, sum of 3 items. | .38  | .78 |
| ATHLID_AVG   | Calculated                                                                  | Athletic Identity, average of 4 items. | 3.52 | 1.17 |

Compassion was measured using the Santa Clara Brief Compassion Scale (SCBCS, [2]). Meat avoidance intent was captured using three yes/no statements (1 = yes; 0 = no; “I avoid eating red meat,” “I avoid eating meat: any animal flesh, e.g. beef, pork, seafood, chicken, etc.” and “I avoid eating any product that comes from an animal.” – adapted from ROZIN). Both scales included irrelevant items to obscure the focus of the survey. The SCBCS variable was calculated by averaging scale items. Meat avoidance intent (MAI, adapted from [8]) was calculated by
summing the affirmative statements after checking them for logical consistency. The MAI score ranges from zero to three, where a higher MAI score indicates an increased intent to avoid meat products. For the analysis, the MAI variable was regressed onto the trait compassion variable, biological sex was included as covariate (0 = female; 1 = male). The SCBCS score significantly predicts the MAI score \( (B = .13, \beta = .17, SE = .04, 95\% CI 0.05 to 0.22, t = 3.03, p < .01) \).

To collect the data provided in the second dataset, 131 participants (68 female) were recruited using Prolific Academic and filled out an online survey using the Qualtrics platform. Trait compassion (SCBCS) was measured at the beginning of the survey and meat avoidance intent (MAI) was measured at the end of the survey using the same instruments as described above. The intervening variables, human animal self-similarity and non-human animal self-similarity, were measured using heat-type map questionnaire items based on the inclusion-of-other-in-the-self (IOS, [3]) and the relational closeness scales [4]. The survey software displayed a sequence of three 400 × 400 pixel squares, each with the emoji of people’s faces in the center (without skin tone modifiers and in random order). Participants were provided with instructions to click towards the center if they felt closeness with what was represented by the emoji or towards the outer boundaries of the square if they did not feel closeness. Three additional emoji of french fries, a car, and a house appeared as well to make the focus of the items less obvious. Subsequently, non-human animal self-similarity was measured using the same method, but with the emoji of a cow, pig, and chicken (fish, octopus, and rabbit as distractors). For each trial, the distance from the center that participants indicated was calculated (0–282 pixels). The variables in the dataset, DIST_HUMAN and DIST_ANIMAL, are the averages of these distances divided by 100 to adjust them to the scale of the other items. For the analysis, the SCBCS score and MAI score were entered as independent and dependent variable in the serial mediation model #6 of Hayes’ [9] PROCESS macro (https://www.processmacro.org/) with biological sex as covariate (0 = female; 1 = male). The human animal and non-human animal distance scores served as intervening variables (trait compassion → human animal distance → non-human animal distance → meat avoidance intent). Statistical inference drawn from 10,000 boot-strapped, bias-corrected, accelerated confidence intervals (CI) indicates that the effect of the SCBCS score on the MAI score is serially mediated by human animal self-similarity and non-human animal self-similarity \( (a1 \times a2 \times b \text{ path} = 0.0104, SE = 0.0078, 95\% CI 0.0015 to 0.0258) \). The SCBCS is negatively associated with DIST_HUMAN (higher perceived closeness to other human animals, inversely expressed as distance, \( a1 = -0.13, SE = .05, 95\% CI -0.22 to -0.04, t = -2.45, p = .016 \)). DIST_HUMAN is positively associated with DIST_ANIMAL \( (a2 = .26, SE = .11, 95\% CI 0.09 to 0.44, t = 2.45, p < .015) \), which is negatively associated with MAI \( (b = -0.30, SE = .11, 95\% CI -0.48 to -0.11, t = -2.70, p < .001) \). The direct effect of SCBCS on MAI is not significant \( (B = .07, SE = .08, 95\% CI -0.07 to 0.20, t = .83, p = .41, N.S.) \); the full path diagram is shown in Fig. 1.
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