

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
ELMER R. KIEHL, *Director*

Consumer Images of Selected Pork Cuts An Exploratory Survey

CECIL L. GREGORY, MARY JO GRINSTEAD, AND JERRY L. WADE



(Publication authorized October 31, 1969)

COLUMBIA, MISSOURI

CONTENTS

Objectives	4
Methods Used and Population Studied	4
Questionnaire Design	5
The Sample	5
Content Analysis	5
Factor Analysis	6
Acceptability Ratings	6
Homemaker's Groupings of Meats	6
Selected Groupings of Meat	13
Acceptability of Individual Cuts	14
Clusters of Animals	16
Special Groupings of Animals	20
Relationship Between Homemakers' Perceptions of Meat-Producing Animals and Derived Meat Cuts	21
Influence of Socio-Economic Class Upon Images of Meats	23
Supportive Data: Homemaker's Image of Meats and Related Consumption Patterns	27
Meats Purchased During the Last Six Months	27
Meats Served for Dinner Most Recently	28
Meats Purchased Most Frequently	29
Pork for a Special Occasion	30
Factors in Pork Acceptability	30
Important Criteria for Purchasing Meat	31
Implications for Further Research	31

SUMMARY AND RESULTS

This research study was designed primarily to answer three dominant questions.

1. What is the homemaker's general image of pork as a meat product and how is this image related to her consumption patterns?

2. How does the homemaker's image of the meat-producing animal affect her acceptance of the derived meat cuts?

3. What influence do socio-economic variables have on meat acceptability?

Investigation showed that meats generally have favorable images among homemakers; also, that homemakers tend to think in terms of categories of meats: beef and liver cuts, organ cuts, and non-organ pork cuts. Of these, organ cuts are the only meats which generally are viewed negatively. When considering a particular cut of meat, a homemaker seems to think first of its general acceptability, and then, in terms of its more specific qualities. Pork cuts have lower acceptability ratings than poultry or beef. This lower rating appears to be largely a result of their perceived fattiness. Neither poultry nor beef is viewed to be as high in fat content as pork.

This exploratory investigation demonstrated little direct connection between the homemaker's image of a meat-producing animal and her attitude toward its derived meat products. That is, knowing a homemaker's image of a meat-producing animal is of little value in predicting her attitudes toward meat cuts derived from that animal. However, it should be noted that a popular way in which to describe meat cuts is in terms of their animal source, and animals are often thought of in terms of the meat cuts which they provide. More work is needed to clarify this relationship.

Our findings suggest that socio-economic factors do have some bearing on attitudes toward both meats and meat-producing animals. Homemakers belonging to the professional socio-economic class tend to have the most positive attitudes toward meats; Negroes, the least favorable. In general, however, the attitudes of homemakers of various socio-economic classes did not differ greatly. The greatest similarity in attitude was toward non-organ pork cuts.

Consumer Images of Selected Pork Cuts

An Exploratory Survey

CECIL L. GREGORY, MARY JO GRINSTEAD, AND LARRY L. WADE

OBJECTIVES

An increasing number of American homemakers consider beef, rather than pork, to be the staple meat in their family's diet. The popularity of beef has increased steadily in the past decade, even in the Southern states where pork consumption traditionally has been highest. Increasing levels of prosperity and shifts in economic and production factors have contributed to the relative decline in pork consumption, but at the same time, it also appears that, in comparison with other meat products, many Americans do not view pork as favorably as they once did. Part of the reason for the decreasing popularity of pork in the United States may be found in ascertaining the general image pork has with the homemaker. The research was designed to explore some of the imagery that a selected group of homemakers associate with certain cuts of pork and to provide information for a more definitive study.

Meat choices differ among individuals and among social groups. Taste preferences and the availability of food in the market are factors which influence meat purchases. Also, specific situations such as guest meals and special holidays affect meat purchases. In addition, the homemaker may take into consideration such items as price, nutritional value, social prestige, and preparation time when she makes her meat selections.

But underlying all of these specific factors may rest a basic attitude or perception of meat cuts that influences purchasing patterns. For instance, how, and to what degree the homemaker associates the animal and the derived meat, may be significant as an influence on her purchasing patterns. Such subconscious associations, in turn, may be related to social class affiliation. The research was directed toward such questions, in particular.

METHODS USED AND POPULATION STUDIED

The major dimensions in which homemakers conceptualize pork as a food product were sought through word association tests. Such tests reveal the terms that a respondent would normally ascribe to any cut of meat or source of meat. In contrast to forced-choice techniques, the word association method permits

subjects a free range of responses, thus providing the respondent with an essentially unstructured test situation. Such a projective technique in which the respondents' answers are minimally influenced by the test design, is excellent for the type of exploratory research reported here. It is possible to ascertain, in the original terms, those dimensions by which homemakers themselves judge meat products, rather than in the terms which the researchers provide.

Questionnaire Design

The questions were oriented around 25 selected pork, beef, mutton, and poultry cuts in several price ranges and seven meat-producing animals. Non-pork cuts of meat were included for comparative purposes; both pork and non-pork meat-producing animals were included to reveal to what extent images of the meats were related to images of the animals. Each respondent was asked to describe each cut of meat and meat-producing animal, using three or four adjectives or descriptive phrases. The investigation, in contrast to many psychological studies, did not stress response time. Rather, the study was concerned with the terms of description used by homemakers.

Questions pertaining to the respondent's age, occupation, section of the country and size of the town in which she had resided for the major portion of her life were included in the questionnaire. Also included were data concerning the actual purchasing habits of the respondent as well as the qualities which she looked for in her selection of the meat.

The Sample

The sample population was composed of 123 homemakers residing in Columbia, Missouri, a town with a population of approximately 40,000. The homemaker was chosen as the person to be interviewed since she does, by far, the major part of the food shopping and preparation.

It was hypothesized that the judgmental or perceptual framework used by members of distinct social groups in describing various cuts of meat would differ; therefore, initially, the sample was stratified into four groups: professional, lower-class white, middle-class white, and Negro. A type of stratified, rather than random, sampling technique was used. Social class affiliation was established on the basis of occupation of the household head using the North-Hatt scale. At least thirty respondents from each of the established groups were interviewed. It might be noted that the occupational levels of the Negro and lower class white respondents were roughly equivalent.

Content Analysis

Respondents were requested to supply three descriptive words or phrases which they would use to characterize each meat cut and meat-producing animal. Such an approach resulted in a large number of heterogeneous data. These data were systematically analyzed by a procedure known as content analysis. In this process, the responses were first examined for commonalities and then grouped on

the basis of the commonalities. Once the content of the responses had been defined, useful categories were established.

The method categorized the actual words and phrases which the homemakers used to describe cuts of meat and meat-producing animals. Responses were first coded into 99 categories. Examples of meat content categories include price, cholesterol content, amount of waste, taste, appearance, nutritive value, prestige value, general acceptability, etc. The method, in categorizing the homemakers' description of meats and meat-producing animals, facilitated an understanding of the evaluative criteria which homemakers use in meat selection. See Table 1.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis has been designed to determine the underlying dimensions among a number of variables or measures. The method is useful in ordering a large number of variables at one time and in identifying the nature of these variables. The relationships between variables can be viewed as a function of their common relationship to a more general dimension.

In the present study, factor analysis was used in ascertaining information on the important criteria which homemakers use in selecting and judging meats and meat-producing animals, the types of homemakers who view meat similarly, and the kinds of meats and meat animals which are viewed in a single construct. A combination of content analysis and factor analysis of the homemakers' descriptions, then, gave a semantic content for the meat cut groups as they are conceived by the homemaker. In a description of the results of this research the meat cuts will sometimes be referred to as "concepts" in keeping with Osgood's use of the term in his *Measurement of Meaning*.*

Acceptability Ratings

Degrees of acceptability for each meat cut and meat-producing animal were assigned to a five-point scale, ranging from 1 as very favorable to 5 as very unfavorable. Four individuals coded the replies of each respondent according to the degree of favorability displayed toward each item. A correlation between the coded ratings was made to determine the degree of agreement between individual coders. The correlation indicated a high degree of consistency and agreement among the coders and, thus, a reliable measure for acceptability.

HOMEMAKER'S GROUPINGS OF MEATS

A basic question in the research was the extent to which homemakers conceptualize meats into categories or groupings. Are meats viewed as independent and unrelated entities rather than in relationship to other meats? What items do they believe to be related to each other? Is pork regarded as a separate category of meat? What are the underlying factors or dimensions which tie these meats together?

*Charles E. Osgood, et. al., *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press (1957).

TABLE 1 - ADJECTIVE CATEGORIES USED IN DESCRIBING ALL MEAT CUTS

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Acceptable (good, like)	1082
Never buy or use	544
Very good, love it, my favorite	444
Associated with manner of preparation	429
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	403
Use occasionally	246
Do not know about or think about	229
Tasty, flavorful	227
Fatty	209
Tender	165
Expensive	128
Revulsion at thought	125
Use frequently	120
Lean	116
Versatile	106
Terrible	105
Associated with other foods	99
Inexpensive	96
Nutritional value	89
Tough	72
Special occasion	70
Juicy	70
Unwilling to use	68
Associated with animal source	60
Easy to prepare	58
Pleasing flavor	57
Pleasing color	48
Strong flavor	40
Difficult to prepare	39
Cured	37
Highly seasoned	37
Family dislikes, will not eat	36
Family likes, will eat	34
Value as a seasoning ingredient	34
Boney	33
Standby	31
High in cholesterol	27
Seasonal	27
Untasty, unflavorful	26
Dry	26

TABLE 1 - CONTINUED

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Unpleasing flavor	25
Meaty	24
Unpleasing color	22
Fit for human consumption	21
Unfamiliar	21
High grade	18
Willing to use	16
Pleased at thought	16
Everyday	14
Many meals with one preparation	12
Unpopular	12
Year-round	11
Special	10
Fresh	10
Gourmet food	9
Digestible	8
Low in nutritional value	6
Mildly seasoned	6
Old-fashioned	6
Mild flavor	5
Preferred by males	5
Low grade	2
One meal from one preparation	2
Low spoilage	1
High spoilage	1
Familiar	1

TABLE 2 - ACCEPTABILITY RATINGS OF MEAT CUTS*

<u>Item</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Distribution</u>
1. Fried chicken	1.77	.77	1.7 ---1
2. Sirloin steak	1.98	1.06	1.8
3. Hamburger	1.98	.67	1.9
4. Beef roast	2.02	.80	2.0 ---2, 3 ---5
5. Ham	2.05	.84	2.1
6. Bacon	2.22	.80	2.2 ---6 ---7
7. Pork chops	2.27	.91	2.3 ---8
8. Turkey	2.32	.85	2.4 ---9
9. Spareribs	2.46	1.00	2.5 --10
10. Pork sausage	2.56	1.12	2.6 --11
11. Pork roast	2.63	.75	2.7 --12 --13
12. Beef liver	2.76	1.24	2.8 --14
13. Boiling beef	2.80	.99	2.9
14. Veal steak	2.85	1.06	3.0 --15
15. Lamb roast	3.07	1.08	3.1
16. Salt pork	3.32	.91	3.2
17. Lamb chops	3.38	1.13	3.3 --16 --17, 18
18. Pork liver	3.38	1.12	3.4 --19
19. Beef tongue	3.48	1.28	3.5 --20
20. Beef heart	3.52	1.19	3.6 --21 --22
21. Pork brains	3.63	1.11	3.7 --23
22. Beef brains	3.65	1.19	3.8 --24
23. Pork heart	3.77	1.03	
24. Pork tongue	3.81	.95	

*The items were scored with 1 being the most acceptable and 4 being the least acceptable.

Using the favorability ratings for meat cuts, a factor analysis according to cuts was run through the computer. Every item of meat was correlated with every other item of meat and five factors or dimensions were extracted from the matrix. Additionally, the descriptive words and phrases by which respondents judged meat cuts were examined systematically using the method of content analysis. The homemakers tended to group the meats into three major categories. Factor I of these was "Beef and Liver Cuts," another, Factor II, was "Non-Organ Pork Cuts," and Factor III was "Organ Meats." Poultry and lamb meats tended to remain unique, not loading on any factor, and much the same was true of the cut "spareribs."

Meats loading on Factor I included veal steak, boiling beef, beef roast, sirloin steak, hamburger, and beef and pork liver. It is interesting to note that two organ meats, beef liver and pork liver, loaded on this factor even though a separate, organ meat factor was also extracted. Apparently liver is not conceptually categorized with other organ meats (which are less desirable). Liver is regarded by many homemakers as being highly nutritious, and because of its dietary value, it is served with more frequency than other organ meats. As a result of its favorable image and consequent high rate of use, homemakers seem to be prone to disregard its organ nature and classify it with non-organ meats. Beef liver is viewed more favorably than pork liver. See Table 2. Generally there is less consensus of attitude toward organ meats than other cuts.

Meats loading on Factor I were generally described by adjectives denoting approval; e.g., "good," "very good," "I like it," or "my favorite." These meats were also associated with popular methods of preparation, and homemakers were inclined to mention recipes which they had found to be especially good for preparing particular cuts. Few respondents considered these meats unpleasing in flavor, texture, or color, and few rejected the meats on the basis of low nutritional value or because members of their family would not eat the cuts. See Table 3.

Factor II was identified as "Non-Organ Pork Cuts." Ham, pork roast, bacon, pork sausage, and pork chops constituted this dimension. These products are viewed as the most acceptable pork cuts. Ham, pork roast, and pork chops were the most frequent responses when homemakers were asked to name the pork cuts they would choose for a special occasion dinner. Bacon and sausage are viewed by many women as standard breakfast meats.

Meats loading on this factor were most frequently described by favorable adjectives. At the same time, these meats were also viewed as being extremely fatty, a popular conception of almost all pork products. Again, these meats were often described in terms of their preparation and frequency of use. The acceptability of the pork cuts loading on Factor II is generally as high as the meat products loading on Factor I, predominantly a beef factor. Thus, although respondents often believe that they view pork with much less approval than beef, homemakers seem to have a positive attitude toward many individual pork cuts. See Table 4.

TABLE 3 - CONTENT ANALYSIS OF BEEF AND LIVER CUTS (FACTOR 1)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
Veal steak	.48
Beef liver	.47
Pork liver	.47
Boiling beef	.44
Beef roast	.42
Sirloin steak	.32
Hamburger	.31

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Acceptable (good, like)	273	40.0
Very good, love it, my favorite	141	20.1
Associated with manner of preparation	117	17.3
Never buy or use, cannot eat	91	13.5
Use occasionally	77	11.4
Tasty, flavorful	75	11.1
Tender	62	9.2
Expensive	58	8.6
Versatile	58	8.6
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	54	8.0
Use frequently	46	6.8
Lean	42	6.2
Juicy	31	4.6
Inexpensive	28	4.2
Fatty	25	3.7
Do not know about or think about	25	3.7
Easy to prepare	24	3.5
Terrible	23	3.4
Nutritional value	22	3.2
Pleasing color	21	3.1
Tough	20	2.9

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 673

TABLE 4 - CONTENT ANALYSIS OF ACCEPTABLE PORK CUTS (FACTOR II)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
Ham	.67
Pork roast	.55
Pork sausage	.53
Pork chops	.52
Bacon	.50

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Acceptable (good, like)	269	55.8
Very good, like it, my favorite	138	28.6
Fatty	119	24.6
Associated with manner of preparation	89	18.4
Tasty, flavorful	70	14.5
Use occasionally	49	10.1
Lean	47	9.7
Use frequently	45	9.3
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	44	9.1
Never buy or use, cannot eat	38	7.8
Expensive	32	6.6
Highly seasoned	28	5.8
Versatile	27	5.6
Tender	25	5.1
Cured	22	4.3
Associated with animal source	21	4.3
Associated with other foods	21	4.1
Inexpensive	20	4.1
Easy to prepare	20	4.1
Pleasing flavor	20	4.1

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 673

All but one of the meats making up Factor III were organ meats. Salt pork loaded on the factor, indicating that that meat is conceptualized with organ products. Most respondents did not view salt pork as suitable for the main dish of a meal, but rather perceived it as having seasoning value for certain foods. The acceptability rankings of the meats loading on Factor III (see Table 2) demonstrate the unfavorable regard in which they are held. Interestingly, organ meats are not distinguished according to whether they are beef or pork, although ratings for the beef organs are slightly more favorable than those for pork. Apparently, individuals who accept organ meats as suitable dietary fare will feel somewhat favorably disposed toward both pork and beef cuts. Similarly, homemakers who maintain that beef organ meats are undesirable also regard pork organ meats negatively. See Table 5.

TABLE 5 - ORGAN MEATS (FACTOR III)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
Pork Tongue	.76
Pork Heart	.69
Beef Heart	.60
Beef Brains	.59
Beef Tongue	.56
Salt Pork	.54
Pork Brains	.50

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never buy or use, cannot eat	239	30.7
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	129	16.6
Acceptable (good, like)	106	13.6
Revulsion at thought	85	10.9
Do not know or do not think about	75	9.6
(Meat) association with manner of preparation	59	7.6
Terrible	51	6.5
Unwilling to use	47	6.0
Use occasionally	30	3.8
Very good, love it, my favorite	23	2.9
(Meat) association with other foods	19	2.4
Hard (tough)	15	1.9
Unfit for human consumption	14	1.8
Soft (tender)	13	1.8
Nutritional value	10	1.2

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 776

Factor III was described most frequently by phrases such a "never buy or use," "can't eat," "unacceptable," "bad," or "dislike." A number of the responses expressed repulsion at the thought of eating tongue, brains, and heart. Many

respondents were unfamiliar with the nature of the cuts and said that they had never considered serving these meats to their families and would be unwilling to use them. Few homemakers described these meats as popular or versatile, and only two described them in terms of frequent use. Of all meat factors, organ meats were considered the least desirable, and well over half of the descriptive words or phrases which were applied to these meats were of a negative nature.

From the analysis, there would appear to be several major ways in which homemakers categorize meats. First, beef and pork products are separated into acceptable and unacceptable categories. Pork is generally viewed separately from beef, and organ meats are classed together. It is of particular interest to our study to point out that pork cuts constitute a separate meat cluster. The fact, then, that a cut of meat is a pork product has a particular meaning for the homemaker.

SELECTED GROUPINGS OF MEAT

In addition to studying the way in which homemakers classify meat cuts, certain groups of meat, of special importance to the investigators, were analyzed.

When descriptions of all pork organ meats were analyzed, it appeared that homemakers were about equally divided on acceptability. There were 107 responses of "bad" or "dislike" recorded and 96 responses of "good" or "like." However, a high number of responses, 52, expressed repulsion at the thought of eating various pork organ meats. In addition, 38 responses indicated unwillingness to use them, and 33 described the meats as "terrible." See Table 6.

Non-organ pork cuts (pork chops, spareribs, pork roast, pork sausage, and salt pork) are viewed more favorably than pork organ meats. Adjectives denoting acceptability such as "good" or "like" appeared 234 times. Extremely favorable adjectives such as "very good," "love it," or "my favorite" appeared 88 times. These cuts received only 61 responses reflecting general unacceptability. However, analysis showed that non-organ pork cuts are perceived as being much fattier than either organ or non-pork cuts. Although non-organ pork cuts are generally viewed as much more appealing than pork organ meats, their fat content is perceived to be much greater.

As with pork organ meats, homemakers show little consensus in their attitudes toward beef organ meats. The images of beef organs are similar to those of pork organs, although pork organs are generally deemed less acceptable. Homemakers were not as prone to describe beef organ cuts as negatively as pork organs. Thus, a higher number and a higher proportion of responses denoting strong negative feelings were obtained from the compared content analyses of pork organ and beef organ cuts. Organ meats do not appear frequently in the diets of a large majority of the respondents. Those homemakers who expressed favorable attitudes toward organ products do not consider them as staple meats. It is significant to note that pork organ cuts, like pork cuts in general, are viewed less favorably than comparable beef products.

TABLE 6 - PORK ORGANS

<u>Item</u>		
	Pork Heart	
	Pork Brains	
	Pork Liver	
	Pork Tongue	
<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	107	16.7
Acceptable (good, like)	96	15.0
Do not know or do not think about	57	8.9
Revulsion at thought	52	8.1
Unwilling to use	38	5.9
(Meat) association with manner of preparation	34	5.3
Terrible	33	5.1
Use occasionally	25	3.9
Hard (tough)	17	2.6
Strong flavor	16	2.5
(Meat) association with other foods	15	2.3
Nutritional value	14	2.1
Unfit for human consumption	10	1.5
Very good, love it, my favorite	10	1.5

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 638

ACCEPTABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL CUTS

To discover what factors make some meats more attractive than others to the homemaker, an understanding of the qualities which are most desired in a cut of meat must be gained. With this intent, the nature of the descriptions of the five most acceptable meats included on the questionnaire form were analyzed.

Table 1 shows that fried chicken is the most favorably viewed meat in the sample, and pork tongue appears to be the least favorably viewed. Organ meats consistently have high standard deviations, indicating a high variability in homemakers' attitudes toward these meats. The least desirable types of meat generally tend to be organ cuts, and non-organ beef; poultry appears to be viewed most favorably.

Forty percent of the adjectives and descriptive phrases applied to fried chicken made reference to its wide approval and high popularity. Responses such as "good," "very good," and "my favorite" were typical. Approximately eight percent of the descriptions were concerned with its manner of preparation, and 6.5 percent dealt with its taste and flavor qualities. Only 0.4 percent of the responses indicated unacceptability, expensiveness, or dirtiness, and only 1.5 percent mentioned fattiness. Fried chicken is then viewed as very acceptable, tasty, frequently used, and inexpensive.

Most homemakers in the sample agreed that hamburger was a highly desirable meat. Although its acceptability rating is slightly lower than that for fried chicken, there is less deviation in attitude. Twenty-eight percent of the descriptions of hamburger involved references to its acceptable nature. The meat was the most versatile in the sample (14.7 percent of the total responses mentioned its versatility). And approximately nine percent of the responses concerned its frequent use. Certainly, it appears that the versatility of hamburger, its relatively low cost, and its satisfactory taste contribute to the popular and acceptable image of the meat.

The high standard deviation of sirloin steak seems to be a result of socioeconomic differences. Although middle and professional class respondents generally viewed the cut as highly acceptable, many lower class respondents held less favorable attitudes, using such phrases as "tough," "don't like," and "never have."

It might be hypothesized that since the price of sirloin steak places it out of the everyday universe of meat for economically disadvantaged women, their attitudes, reflecting low acceptability, are developed as a rationalization or explanation of purchasing habits. This line of reasoning receives some support from the observation that the meats which are purchased most frequently are also viewed most favorably. Homemakers make meat selections in view of budget limitations. When cost concerns do not permit the purchase of an expensive cut, there would appear to be a downgrading of the meat's image and an upgrading of the acceptability of those cuts which they can purchase. This may explain why hamburger and chicken, the two meats with the highest acceptability rankings, were also named by a majority of respondents as the meats they purchased most frequently.

Although sirloin steak was described in 33 percent of the responses as acceptable, many of those who described it as less favorable also indicated its expensiveness and infrequent use. Like fried chicken, homemakers associated sirloin steak with modes of preparation. Only 4.7 percent of the descriptions of the item reflected a completely unacceptable image of the meat.

Thirty-five percent of the responses to beef roast reflected acceptability. This meat is viewed as *tasty, flavorful, tender, versatile, and moderately expensive*.

Thirty-six percent of the responses to ham stressed its acceptability. It might be noted that ham was the most popular pork cut sampled. It was described as *tasty, flavorful, cured, and expensive*.

It is important to emphasize that a homemaker's perception of various meat cuts may not correspond closely, if at all, to their actual expensiveness and availability in the market. When a woman goes to the meat counter she may be unaware of the available items, even if these items are in close physical proximity to those which she customarily purchases. A homemaker may believe that a relatively inexpensive meat is too costly for her budget, and she may explain her unwillingness to purchase the meat for that reason. By the same token, the un-

willingness to purchase a meat that is, in fact, too costly may be explained by attributed, undesirable characteristics. Some women, for example, commented that their families ate little or no pork; yet these same women remarked that they served ham occasionally and often served bacon for breakfast. Evidently these women had defined bacon and ham out of their universe of pork products.

In summary, the most important criterion by which homemakers judge meat is general acceptability—whether they like or dislike the meat product. Adjectives specifying taste and flavor, expense, manner of preparation, and extent of use also rank high. It is significant that none of the meats which are highly acceptable are viewed as high in fat content. Ham, the only pork cut which appears on the list of our five most acceptable meats, was not viewed as fatty (only .4 percent of the responses mentioned fattiness in regard to ham). It would appear that the perceived high fat content of non-organ pork cuts is a key factor which detracts from their popularity and acceptability.

CLUSTERS OF ANIMALS

The techniques of factor analysis, content analysis, and correlation were useful in examining the images of various meat-producing animals and in determining the extent to which a homemaker's image of a meat-producing animal affects her image of derived meat products.

The analysis indicated that meat-producing animals are judged by different criteria than meat cuts. Large or mature animals are viewed similarly enough to form a single factor; small or young animals are judged to an extent sufficient to form another factor.

Animal concepts loading on the factor which was labeled "Large Animals" included big pigs, hogs, cows, and steers. These animals are viewed negatively by respondents. Homemakers are inclined to perceive small, young animals as "cute," "innocent," and "sweet," but once these animals are grown, these personality traits disappear. Replacing these favorable descriptions are such words as "mean," "I'm afraid of them," and "lazy."

The content analysis of the descriptive terms used in identifying large animals revealed that big pigs, hogs, cows, and steers are frequently thought of in terms of their derived food products. The animals were generally perceived as dirty, large animals, but respondents were almost equally divided on whether or not these animals have a pleasant or unpleasant "personality." Additionally, about half of our sample viewed big pigs, hogs, cows, and steers as pretty; the other half thought of them as ugly. A sizable proportion of the respondents were unable to form a mental image of large farm animals, or at least to construct a mental image sufficient to permit a description of the animals. Generally, images of large meat-producing animals were of a slightly negative nature; adjectives such as "stupid," "lazy," and "awkward" were used much more frequently than their positive counterparts. See Table 7.

TABLE 7 - CONTENT ANALYSIS OF LARGE ANIMALS (FACTOR IV)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
Big pigs	.62
Hogs	.60
Cows	.46

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Associated with the derived food product	120	18.5
Dirty	96	14.8
Large	71	10.9
Unpleasant personality	59	9.1
Pretty	51	7.8
Ugly	47	7.2
Pleasing personality	47	7.2
Acceptable (good, like)	39	6.0
Do not know about or think about	37	5.7
Lazy	25	3.8
Interesting to watch	23	3.5
Awkward	23	3.5
Revulsion at thought	21	3.2
Associated with color of animal	21	3.2
Associated with its habitat	20	3.0
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	18	2.7
Stupid	10	1.5

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 648

Small, young animals (baby chickens, calves, and little pigs) loaded on a fifth factor. These animals are regarded much more favorably than their grown counterparts. Many women expressed the opinion that small farm animals make good pets for children. These young animals are very infrequently associated with cuts of meat. Their value seems to be largely an aesthetic rather than an economic one.

Almost half of the descriptive responses referred to the pleasing "personalities" of these animals; only ten responses suggested dislike. Frequently the homemakers described the energetic nature of the animals, their acceptability as pets, their pleasant appearance, and their interesting behavior. A number of responses indicated that even immature farm animals are sometimes thought of in terms of their potential for meat production. These small animals are viewed as being dirty more often than clean, but unlike the larger animals, the image of uncleanness does not appear to detract markedly from their favorable image. See Table 8.

TABLE 8 - CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SMALL ANIMALS (FACTOR V)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
Baby chickens	.66
Calves	.69
Little pigs	.52

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Pleasing personality	213	46.0
Energetic	44	9.5
Associated with derived food product	43	9.2
Acceptable (good, like)	40	8.6
Good pets	30	6.4
Small	27	5.8
Interesting to watch	26	5.6
Pretty	24	5.1
Do not know about or think about	23	4.9
Soft, tender	22	4.7
Dirty	20	4.3
Associated with color of animal	16	3.4
Awkward	12	2.5
Unacceptable	10	2.1

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 463

Calves and baby chickens are viewed as the most acceptable animals while big pigs and hogs have the most negative images. Although the attitude that big pigs and hogs are dirty, sloppy, and mean may well influence certain consumers' images of pork products, the research indicated that most homemakers do not think of the living animal when they go to the meat market.

The overriding factors in judging animals seem to be personality, appearance, and age, rather than quality or kind of derived meat. As with all meat-producing animals, the smaller and younger animals are viewed more favorably than the larger and older ones. Many people responded to items such as baby chickens, calves, and little pigs with a statement such as "I think all small animals are cute." However, it is of some significance that little pigs are viewed less favorably than either baby chickens or calves.

Chi-square statistics between socio-economic groups and Factor IV (Large Meat-Producing Animals) indicated significant differences in attitude. The most severely negative attitudes toward large meat-producing animals were voiced by the Negro homemaker. Middle-class white respondents seemed most favorably disposed toward these animals. The bulk of our respondents' ratings ranged from slightly negative to very negative. See Table 9.

TABLE 9 - RATINGS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS
FOR LARGE ANIMALS (FACTOR IV)

RATINGS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			
	Professional	Negro	Middle class white	Lower class white
2.99 and below	4	8	3	8
3.00 to 3.39	12	7	17	8
3.40 to 3.79	16	4	5	9
3.80 and above	1	11	5	5

$$X^2 = 28.4860$$

d.f. = 9

NOTE: Each of the homemakers' responses were rated according to their degree of favorability on a five point scale, with one being very favorable and five being very unfavorable.

Ratings of respondents on Factor V (Small Animals), subjected to a chi-square test, revealed significant differences between socio-economic groups. Although all socio-economic classes viewed these animals favorably, the degree of favorability varied with social class affiliation. Lower class whites felt most favorably toward these animals; Negroes, least favorably. See Table 10.

TABLE 10 - RATINGS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS
FOR SMALL ANIMALS (FACTOR V)

RATINGS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			
	Professional	Negro	Middle class white	Lower class white
1.00 to 2.19	11	5	10	17
2.20 to 2.99	13	8	12	11
3.00 and above	9	17	8	2

$$X^2 = 20.98$$

d.f. = 6

NOTE: Each of the homemakers' responses were rated according to their favorability on a five point scale, with one being very favorable and five being very unfavorable.

SPECIAL GROUPINGS OF ANIMALS

In addition to content analyzing of meat and animal factors, certain groups of animals of particular interest were studied.

Pork-producing animals were grouped together and their descriptions, analyzed. The most prevalent adjective used to describe these animals was "dirty," an adjective which takes on even less favorable connotations with the association of derived food products. Pork-producing animals are viewed as having both pleasant and unpleasant "personalities," depending largely upon the maturity of the animal. Little pigs, for example, are generally viewed as agreeable and interesting, but grown pigs and hogs are often described in adverse terms. Many homemakers admitted that they were afraid of hogs, viewing these animals as "mean" and "vicious." It appears, therefore, that all pork-producing animals are perceived as being dirty, but the degree of favorability with which their "personalities" are regarded is a direct function of size and age. Pork-producing animals were also commonly characterized in terms of their derived food products, although this type of portrayal is more typical among persons from rural backgrounds than of homemakers as a whole. See Table 11.

TABLE 11 - CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PORK-PRODUCING ANIMALS

<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Item</u>		<u>Percent</u>
	Little pigs	Big pigs Hogs	
	<u>Frequency</u>		
Dirty	113		25.5
Pleasing personality	85		19.1
Associated with the derived food product	55		12.4
Ugly	43		9.7
Unpleasant personality	43		9.7
Acceptable (good, like)	37		8.3
Large	28		6.3
Do not know or do not think about	22		4.9
Awkward	21		4.7
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	20		4.5
Revulsion at thought	20		4.5
Energetic	20		4.5
Associated with habitat	19		4.2
Interesting to watch	18		4.0
Pretty	16		3.6
Associated with color of animal	16		3.6
Good pets	13		2.9
Fatty	11		2.4

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 443

When descriptions of non-pork animals were analyzed, it was found that "personality" descriptions occurred more frequently than descriptions in terms of cleanliness. Only eight responses of "dirty" were used in reference to baby chickens, calves, cows, steers, and hens, whereas 113 responses of "dirty" were applied to pork-producing animals. Thus of all types of farm animals included on the questionnaire, the factor of cleanliness was significant only for those from which pork is derived.

Although homemakers as a whole demonstrated no strong negative attitudes toward the personality traits of pigs and hogs, other farm animals were viewed much more favorably. Our responses included 20 replies indicating repulsion at the thought of pigs and hogs, but only two responses of repulsion were given for all other animals combined. The adjective "pretty" was rarely applied to pork animals (16 responses), but it was often given for other animals (67 responses). Conversely, the adjective "ugly" was used 43 times in characterizing pork-producing animals, but only ten times in response to non-pork animals. See Table 12.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOMEMAKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF MEAT-PRODUCING ANIMALS AND DERIVED MEAT CUTS

One of the major objectives of this study was to ascertain the degree to which a homemaker's image of a meat-producing animal influences her image of its derived meat cuts. Does, for example, the fact that hogs and big pigs are generally conceived to be dirty stimulate homemakers to view pork as unclean? Is a homemaker who has a negative image of hogs more likely to dislike pork than a homemaker who has a more positive attitude? And is the generally negative image of pork, in part, a result of the unfavorable perception of big pigs and hogs?

To test this relationship, several statistical tests were used. For example, homemakers' descriptions of meat-producing animals were compared with descriptions of derived meat cuts. This analysis revealed that there was no consistent pattern between the manner in which an individual viewed hogs, say, and the way in which she viewed its meat products. A homemaker may then view hogs as dirty and repulsive and still maintain that pork roast is an appetizing and highly acceptable meat.

It appears that homemakers are not particularly aware of the living animal when they select meat for their families. Certainly, urban living has taken many people out of contact with farm animals, and meat packaging does little to remind shoppers of the animal source of their meats. Furthermore, a statistical test of association indicated that knowing the degree of favorability which a homemaker exhibits toward a given meat-producing animal is of little value in predicting her degree of favorability toward a given meat product.

Unless one can see some semantic connection between the fact that women often view hogs as dirty and pork as fatty, a relationship that is not obvious to the authors, there is no very obvious or direct association between the image of

the animal and its meat product. At the same time, such a relationship should not be ruled out simply because it is not made obvious by this research. Indeed, our content analysis reveals that some homemakers do describe meats in terms of their animal source and animals in terms of their meat-producing potential.

TABLE 12 - CONTENT ANALYSIS OF ALL NON PORK-PRODUCING ANIMALS

	<u>Item</u>	
	Baby chickens	Calves Cows
<u>Adjective</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Pleasing personality	187	23.4
Associated with the derived food product	158	19.7
Acceptable (good, like)	77	9.6
Pretty	67	8.3
Large	51	6.3
Energetic	44	5.5
Do not know or do not think about	40	5.0
Interesting to watch	36	4.5
Good pets	28	3.5
Meat associated with manner of preparation	28	3.5
Unpleasant personality	26	3.2
Associated with color of animal	25	3.1
Soft, tender	24	3.0
Lazy	21	2.6
Unacceptable (bad, dislike)	17	2.1
Stupid	17	2.1
Small	17	2.1
Awkward	15	1.9
Associated with breed	13	1.6
Very good, love it	11	1.3
Associated with habitat	11	1.3
Ugly	10	1.2
Tasty, flavorful	9	1.1
Hard, tough	9	1.1
Associated with other foods	9	1.1
Associated with its role in reproduction	9	1.1
Pleased at thought	8	1.0
Dirty	8	1.0

NUMBER OF RESPONSES 799

INFLUENCE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS UPON IMAGES OF MEATS

Although a factor analysis of the socio-economic groups which are selected *a priori* according to husbands' occupations revealed that our sample groups were not as homogeneous in their attitudes toward selected meat cuts and meat animals as might have been expected; there were significant differences in perception between social classes (see Tables 13 and 14). In comparison with women in other socio-economic groups, professional class homemakers were more favorably disposed toward sirloin steak, beef roast, pork roast, lamb roast, lamb chops, beef tongue, pork heart, and pork tongue. Meats which are viewed more favorably by Negro respondents than other homemakers included ham, pork chops, spare-ribs, pork sausage, hens, and boiling beef. Middle-class white homemakers were more favorable in their attitudes toward bacon, veal steak, and beef heart. In comparison to homemakers in other socio-economic groups, lower-class white women reflected a less favorable attitude toward pork brains and beef brains.

To evaluate differences in attitude toward meats and meat-producing animals, chi-square values were computed for the responses of homemakers representative of the various social classes. Computations were based upon general acceptability ratings.

A chi-square, computed for the mean ratings of homemakers of each socio-economic class for Factor I, Beef and Liver Cuts, shows significant differences between groups. University and professional-class homemakers expressed more favorable attitudes toward these meat cuts than the other respondents. Negro homemakers expressed the least favorability, and attitudes of the lower-class white respondents were somewhat more positive than those of the middle-class white homemakers. See Table 15.

Significant social class differences were also apparent for Factor III, Organ Meats. Professional-class respondents found organ meats most acceptable; Negroes displayed the most negative feelings. However, favorability ratings for each of the socio-economic groups were low. Attitude differences may be a partial result of economic factors. The professional-class homemaker can include organ meats in her family diet as variety items; she may view these items as interesting additions to her menu, as meats which challenge her culinary skills. The Negro homemaker, on the other hand, may be forced by economic pressures to restrict purchases to relatively inexpensive cuts. To her, organ meats may be viewed as inexpensive, low-status cuts, food products to be avoided. Their potential as variety items goes largely unrecognized, for the Negro family seems to prefer more (See Table 16) "standard" items. The highly unacceptable organ meats should, in the Negro homemaker's opinion, be largely eliminated from the family diet. Middle- and lower-class white respondents were also negative toward organ cuts, although their attitudes were less strong than those of the Negro.

TABLE 13 - ACCEPTABLE-UNACCEPTABLE RANKINGS OF MEAT CONCEPTS
OVERALL AND BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS

Concept	Overall Rank	Professional	Negro	Middle-Class White	Lower Class White
Fried Chicken	1	2.5	1	1	1
Sirloin Steak	2.5	1	7	4	5.5
Hamburger	2.5	5	2	2	2
Beef Roast	4	2.5	5.5	3	4
Ham	5	4	3	5.5	3
Bacon	6	7	8	5.5	7
Pork Chops	7	9	4	9.5	5.5
Turkey	8	6	9	7	8
Spareribs	9.5	12	5.5	8	11
Pork Sausage	9.5	13	10	9.5	12.5
Pork Roast	11	8	13	11.5	12.5
Beef Liver	12	10	11.5	14	15
Boiling Beef	13	18	14	13	9.5
Hens	14.5	17	11.5	16	9.5
Veal Steak	14.5	15.5	16	11.5	14
Lamb Roast	16	11	15	15	21
Salt Pork	17	19	18	19.5	19
Lamb Chops	18	14	19	17.5	22
Pork Liver	19.5	22	17	19.5	16
Beef Tongue	19.5	15.5	22	21	20
Beef Heart	21	20	22	17.5	23
Pork Brains	22	25	20	24	17
Beef Brains	23	24	22	22.5	18
Pork Heart	24	21	25	22.5	24
Pork Tongue	25	23	24	25	25

TABLE 14 - ACCEPTABILITY MEAT-PRODUCING RANKINGS OF ANIMALS
OVERALL AND BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS

Concept	Overall Rank	Professional	Negro	Middle-Class White	Lower-Class White
Baby Chicken	1	1.5	3	2	1
Calves	2	1.5	2	1	2
Little Pigs	3	3	5	3	3
Cows	4	5	1	4	4
Steers	5	4	4	5	5
Hogs	6	7	6	6	6
Big Pigs	7	6	7	7	7

TABLE 15 - RATINGS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS
FOR BEEF AND LIVER CUTS (FACTOR I)

RATINGS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			
	Professional	Negro	Middle class white	Lower class white
1.00 to 2.19	18	5	9	10
2.20 to 2.99	12	9	11	14
3.00 and above	3	16	10	6

$$X^2 = 19.884$$

$$d.f. = 6$$

NOTE: Each of the homemakers' responses were rated according to their degree of favorability on a five point scale, with one being very favorable and five being very unfavorable.

TABLE 16 - RATINGS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS
FOR ORGAN MEATS (FACTOR III)

RATINGS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			
	Professional	Negro	Middle class white	Lower class white
2.99 and below	11	2	3	7
3.00 to 3.79	12	6	10	8
3.80 to 4.59	8	9	14	9
4.60 to 4.99	2	13	3	6

$$X^2 = 25.18$$

$$d.f. = 9$$

NOTE: Each of the homemakers' responses were rated according to their favorability on a five point scale, with one being very favorable and five being very unfavorable.

Knowledge of meat products differs with socio-economic affiliation. Wives of professionals are more willing to experiment with a wide variety of meats and to prepare new recipes. Certainly, their exposure to nutritional information is likely to be substantial, but it appears, too, that dietary variety is a value which is stressed by these women. Working class women in many cases have a smaller food budget, but there seems to be less pressure exerted upon them to prepare a variety of foods. Negro women were even less willing to experiment with unfamiliar meats and purchased a large number of easily prepared meats. With a number of the Negro women not living with husbands the absence of males in some Negro homes may provide a partial explanation for "standard" menus. Cooking only for herself and her children, who may be well satisfied with hamburgers and hot dogs, the Negro woman may forego the innovations that a husband would appreciate. It appears, therefore, that Negro and lower class women are not subjected to as many pressures to improve and expand their knowledge of meats as are wives of professionals. Further research, however, is needed to confirm this speculation.

Group differences based upon socio-economic criteria were significant for all factors except Factor II, Acceptable Pork Cuts. It appears from the analysis that the attitudes of various socio-economic groups differ significantly in regard to acceptable beef cuts and organ meats. Attitudes toward the more prestigious forms of pork (ham, bacon, pork chops, pork sausage, and pork roast), however, show little significant variation according to socio-economic factors. Ratings on the factor are generally quite positive, with approximately one third of the responses indicating a very acceptable attitude. See Table 17.

TABLE 17 - RATINGS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS
FOR ACCEPTABLE PORK CUTS (FACTOR II)

RATINGS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS			
	Professional	Negro	Middle class white	Lower class white
1.00 to 2.19	12	8	9	14
2.20 to 2.99	18	15	15	9
3.00 and above	3	7	6	7

$$X^2 = 6.7228$$

$$d.f. = 6$$

NOTE: Each of the homemakers' responses were rated according to their favorability on a five point scale, with one being very favorable and five being very unfavorable.

In summary, the data indicate that a homemaker's socio-economic class affiliation influences her image of various meat cuts. However, it is significant that homemakers' images of such pork cuts as ham, bacon, pork chops, and pork sausage do not differ markedly with social class. Of all meat groups tested, the more prestigious cuts of pork are viewed most consistently in all four social classes.

SUPPORTIVE DATA: HOMEMAKER'S IMAGE OF MEATS AND RELATED CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

Meats Purchased During the Last Six Months

To ascertain the correlation between a homemaker's attitude toward a selected meat cut and her actual pattern of purchasing that meat, respondents were given a check list on which to report those meats which they had purchased for their families during the past six months. Results are summarized in Table 18.

TABLE 18 - MEATS PURCHASED IN THE PAST SIX MONTHS

<u>Meat</u>	<u>Did Purchase</u>	<u>Did Not Purchase</u>
Hamburger	118	5
Bacon	113	10
Beef Roast	110	13
Ham	106	17
Pork Chops	96	27
Pork Sausage	90	33
Sirloin Steak	84	39
Pork Roast	72	51
Spareribs	64	59
Pork Cutlets	50	73
Pork Brains	15	108
Salt Pork	13	110
Pork Tongue	5	118
Pork Heart	5	118

Those meats which homemakers had purchased during the period were generally those which received highly favorable ratings in our study: hamburger, bacon, beef roast, ham, and pork chops. These meats had been purchased by the vast majority of our respondents. It might be noted that even those homemakers who possessed a positive attitude toward these meats viewed them as special or variety cuts.

A correlation between homemakers' acceptability ratings of organ and non-organ pork cuts and the number of pork cuts purchased during the six month's period demonstrated that a respondent's image of pork does have some effect on her consumption of that meat. One could expect those individuals who have a

favorable image of pork organ meats, for example, to purchase these cuts somewhat more frequently than those homemakers who have a less favorable image of the cut. Such was the case as presented below.

Meat Served for Dinner Most Recently

As another indicator of the relationship between a homemaker's attitudes toward meats and her purchasing patterns, respondents were asked what meat they served for dinner most recently. Hamburger, beef roast, steak, and chicken were the most frequently reported responses to this question. Ham was mentioned with less frequency. The most popular meats for family meals appear to be beef cuts and poultry, indicating, again, that beef and poultry are more popular and acceptable kinds of meat than pork products. While beef and poultry are considered to be the staple meats for the dinner meal, such pork cuts as bacon and sausage predominate at breakfast. See Table 19.

TABLE 19 - MEATS SERVED FOR MOST RECENT DINNER

<u>Item</u>	<u>Frequency of Mention</u>
Hamburger	25
Beef Roast	17
Steak	15
Chicken	15
Ham	9
Fish	6
Pork Chops	5
Pork Roast	5
Pork Tenderloin	5
Turkey	4
Bacon	3
Beef Liver	2
Spareribs	2
Variety Meats	1
Sausage	1
Veal Steak	1
Hot Dogs	1
Rabbit	1
Oysters	1

A correlation between ratings of homemakers' pork acceptability and the type of meat which they served for their most recent dinner meal revealed that acceptability was largely unrelated to the choice of a dinner meat. The relatively infrequent appearance of pork at the dinner table, then, may be less a function of one's view of the acceptability of pork than a function of the popularity and inexpensiveness of other types of meat.

Meats Purchased Most Frequently

Homemakers were asked to list, in order, the three meats they most frequently purchased. Hamburger appeared at the top of this three-line list most often. Also appearing often at the top of the list were chicken, steak, and beef roast. In the second line, or "second choice" category, chicken appeared most often with hamburger, beef roast, and pork chops also appearing frequently. At the bottom of the list, in "third choice," chicken, again, appeared most often; hamburger, pork chops, and steak, also appearing frequently. Chicken and hamburger, as might be expected, are the most frequently purchased meats. As we have seen, they are well accepted, viewed as tasty, and relatively inexpensive and versatile. It is significant in terms of the objectives of this study to note that no pork product ranks high on the responses to this question. Even though certain pork cuts (ham, pork roast, pork chops) have relatively high acceptability ratings, it seems that homemakers fail to purchase any of these meats for their families as often as either hamburger or chicken. Hamburger and chicken were each listed 71 times as first, second, or third choice, while beef roast, the third most popular cut, was mentioned a total of only 42 times. Steak was listed 38 times; pork chops, 24; ham, 18; and bacon, 13. See Table 20.

The relationship between pork acceptability ratings and the number of pork choices listed as a response to this question was tested. Although there was some tendency for those homemakers, who viewed pork as highly acceptable, to purchase pork products more frequently, the correlation was not high. It appears

TABLE 20 - KINDS OF MEAT PURCHASED MOST FREQUENTLY

<u>Item</u>	<u>Frequency of Mention</u>
Chicken	71
Hamburger	71
Beef Roast	42
Steak	38
Pork Chops	24
Ham	18
Bacon	13
Beef (all kinds)	11
Pork Roast	7
Pork Sausage	7
Pork Steak	6
Hot Dogs	5
Fish	4
Beef Liver	4
Pork Tenderloin	2
Variety Meats	2
Lamb Roast	2
Lamb Chops	2

then, that it is not unacceptability *per se* which discourages pork consumption, but the high popularity and use of such meats as hamburger and chicken. It should be noted that one cannot predict total demand for a product from these data since the relative sizes of the sample groups are not necessarily representative of the entire population.

Pork for a Special Occasion

Homemakers were asked the question, "What kinds of pork would you serve for dinner on a special occasion or company meal?" From this tabulation of responses to this question, the cuts of pork which homemakers viewed as prestigious could be identified. Pork roast and ham were the most common responses, both cuts receiving an approximately equal number of choices, 40 and 39 respectively. Sixteen homemakers replied that they would not consider serving pork for a special occasion meal, and an additional 15 said that pork chops would be their first choice. It appears that pork roast and ham are the most prestigious cuts of pork; although, for a sizable number of homemakers, pork seems to be undesirable for special meals. See Table 21.

TABLE 21 - PORK FOR A SPECIAL OCCASION

<u>Pork Item</u>	
Pork Roast	40
Ham	39
Would Not Serve	16
Pork Chops	15
Pork Cutlets	4
Pork Steak	3
Spareribs	2
Pork Sausage	1

Factors in Pork Acceptability

Homemakers were asked the question, "Why don't you eat more pork?" It was hoped that replies to this question might provide some insight into those qualities of pork which make its acceptability and consumption relatively low. The most common response to the question, however, was "We do eat a lot of pork," indicating again that the generalized image of pork may not be negative. Family or personal preference were cited by 35 respondents as reasons for their infrequent pork consumption. Other responses included references to health, extensive fat content, and high cholesterol content. Only one homemaker made reference to the possibility of acquiring trichinosis from improperly cooked pork, and only one mentioned that religious beliefs caused her abstention. See Table 22.

TABLE 22 - FACTORS IN PORK ACCEPTABILITY

<u>Response</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Do eat a lot	39
Family or personal preference	18
Don't care for it	17
Health factors	14
Too fatty	11
Not good for you	9
Too much cholesterol	6
Not good as a staple meat	3
Religious factors	1
Must be careful cooking	1

Important Criteria for Purchasing Meat

Homemakers were asked to list those factors which they took into consideration when purchasing meat. Cost, fat and bone content, quality, and color of the meat were the most important considerations. Cost was the single most important criterion, followed closely by fat and waste content. It would appear that when a homemaker goes to the supermarket she looks first to see whether or not the price of the meat fits within her food budget. If it does, then the quality of the meat itself (waste, fat, color, and quality) finally determines the selection.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Perhaps the most perplexing problem arising from this study was that of determining the degree to which a homemaker's image of meat is related to her image of its animal source. The data reveal that homemakers do see some relationship, but the effect of this perceived relationship upon attitudes and purchasing patterns must await further investigation.

Although quantitative data are not available from the study, it appeared that the presence or absence of children and/or a male adult in the household has an appreciable effect on the homemaker's perception of various meat cuts. In the case of male absenteeism, women seemed less likely to prepare full meals; turning, instead, to easily prepared and ready-to-use meats. It also appeared that the family with children preferred a somewhat different repertoire of meats than the childless family.

Data collected through the use of the open-ended questionnaire seemed to reveal that the homemaker judged meat primarily in terms of her personal like or dislike. When a respondent was asked to describe a meat cut, the most common answer was "I like it" or "I don't like it." It was only when the respondent was asked to give further description that she responded with more specific qualities of the meat such as "fatty," "nutritious," "expensive," etc. It may be, therefore, that the framework in which homemakers judge meat is largely unidi-

mensional and that such qualities as fat content, nutritional value, and cost are not separate dimensions by which homemakers judge meats but component elements of its general acceptability. Further research is needed to explore this problem.

This study indicated that economic factors limited the homemaker's universe of meats. However, the role of these factors may differ considerably from what might be expected. For example, meats usually defined as "low income" foods may have a greater acceptability and may be used by middle- and upper-income families. For example Table 16 reveals that organ cuts are more acceptable to professional than lower class and Negro homemakers. A possible explanation for this phenomenon may be that middle-class and professional-class homemakers tend to view these cuts as variety items while lower income women view them only as "cheap" meats which should be avoided if possible. Thus it seems that price is not a limiting factor for the universe of meat for professional-class women, while the lower-income homemakers exclude the very low priced items and the expensive items from their meat universe. The sociological and marketing ramifications of these phenomena are wide and need to be explored further.

Another interesting question centers around the fact that pork spareribs and lamb cuts tended to be unique in the classification system derived from factor analysis. What sets spareribs apart from other pork cuts deserves further analysis.