

MEAT BUYING AND PREPARATION PRACTICES OF
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN, HOMEMAKERS

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Josephine Lawyer
1963



ABSTRACT

MEAT BUYING AND PREPARATION PRACTICES OF ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN, HOMEMAKERS

by Josephine Lawyer

This is a study of the meat buying and preparation practices of urban Michigan homemakers. Four areas of investigation include factors influencing homemakers' meat buying and preparation practices, homemakers' use of available information about meat buying, homemakers' interpretation of information about meat buying, and the kinds of information about meat buying homemakers want. Data for the study were obtained from 304 homemakers in Royal Oak, Michigan, by personal interview. Many of the responses were cross tabulated with the following characteristics: homemakers' age and education, family income and size of family.

The majority of the homemakers reported they made most family meat purchases in a large food store on Thursday, Friday or Saturday. Purchases were made in stores that provided "quality" meat.

Homemakers purchased and prepared more beef than other red meats, poultry, fish, or other meat products. Dishes most frequently prepared included those made with ground beef, beef roast, chicken, and pork chops.

There was evidence that some homemakers plan meat purchases before shopping. Approximately half made written shopping lists and about 60 percent of this group listed intended meat purchases by kind and cut. Seventy percent of the sample were aware that the stores in which they shopped advertised meat specials at the end of the week. Forty percent of this group reported buying a meat special every week.

Meat buying and preparation practices were influenced by the homemakers' knowledge of selection and preparation. Color of the lean, more lean and less fat, and marbling were guides most often used for beef selection. Preparation terminology and temperatures used for beef, pork, poultry, and fish items indicated that approximately half the sample lacked basic knowledge of meat cookery.

Homemakers indicated that family preference, nutrition, cost, and quality were factors influencing meat purchase decisions. The size of the package or piece, the quality or appearance, and price were listed as factors influencing purchase at the store.

Homemakers reported using store advertising, various media, and the meat departments in retail stores as sources of useful information about meat buying. Sixty-two percent checked store advertising in newspapers weekly and 72 percent had checked store circulars within six weeks prior to the survey.

Newspapers were judged the most useful media for information about meat other than that carried in ads. Half the homemakers

reported finding useful information about meat buying in newspapers during the six weeks prior to the survey, compared to 18 percent for television and 14 percent for radio. Homemakers using these media judged price information most useful. Supply information ranked second. Planning before going to the store was judged the most important applied use of the information gathered via media.

Half the homemakers reported using store displays for useful information about meat buying during the two or three months prior to the survey. One-third used meat labels, and one-fourth secured information about meat from store personnel.

Homemakers varied in ability to interpret news writing providing information about meat. Those under 40 years of age scored higher than other age groups. Less than half the sample interpreted the information in the same manner as did the writer. Information on cost comparison was more accurately interpreted than information on grades, seasonality or outlook.

Homemakers indicated that news releases including information on meat grades, cost comparison, seasonality, and outlook would be useful. Information on meat grades was judged most useful. Cost comparison information ranked second and outlook information was scored least useful. When asked which releases they would look for if they knew they were in the paper, the rank remained the same.

When asked to express opinions as to kinds of information about meat buying other homemakers want, the respondents listed meat cookery, meat costs and guides for selection as primary concerns. These were scored by half to two-thirds of the sample.

MEAT BUYING AND PREPARATION PRACTICES
OF ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN, HOMEMAKERS

By
Josephine Lawyer

A THESIS

Submitted to the College of Agriculture
Michigan State University of Agriculture and
Applied Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Agricultural Economics

1963

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to all who made the completion of this thesis possible.

Special gratitude is extended Dr. James D. Shaffer, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics at Michigan State University who guided and directed the study.

The author is grateful for the cooperation and assistance in planning and construction of the questionnaire by Dr. Robert C. Kramer, Director, Agricultural Marketing and Utilization Center, Michigan State University, and Miriam J. Kelley, Assistant Director, Home Economics, Cooperative Extension Service, Michigan State University.

The author is also appreciative of the assistance given in reviewing the purpose of the study and the pretest of the questionnaire by:

Dr. Alice C. Thorpe, Professor and Chairman, Home Management and Child Development, Home Economics, Michigan State University;

Marie Ferree, Specialist, Consumer Marketing Information, Home Economics, Michigan State University.

Special gratitude is expressed to the Cooperative Extension Service for granting sabbatical leave and additional time to complete the survey and thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives of the Study	3
Survey Method and Sample Characteristics	4
Selection of the Sample	4
Background Data	5
Description of the Sample	6
Age Distribution of the Homemaker	6
Size of Households	7
Income of the Household Units	9
Education of the Homemaker	10
Occupation of Breadwinner	11
Employment of Female Homemakers	11
Household Type	12
Other Characteristics	12
Indications of Sample Bias	12
II. MEAT BUYING AND PREPARATION PRACTICES	14
Meat Buying Practices	14
Stores in Which Meat Was Purchased	14
Homemakers' Reasons for Buying Meat	
at Stores Where Purchased	14
Day of Last Meat Purchase	16
Person Making Last Meat Purchase	16
Amount Spent for Food Used at Home	17
Family Meat Expenditure	21
Meals Eaten Away from Home	24
Use of Shopping Lists	25
Influence of Meat Advertisement by	
Retail Stores	28
Homemakers' Opinions of Why Stores	
Feature Certain Meat Cuts	29
Influence of Trading Stamps	30
Homemakers' Opinions Concerning	
Prepackaged Meat	30
Meats Most Frequently Purchased	32

CHAPTER**Page**

Homemakers' Reasons for Recent Meat Choices	33
Factors Influencing Beef Purchases	34
Reasons for Changing Intended Meat Purchase in the Store	37
Homemakers' Opinions Concerning Certain Meats	38
Homemakers' Opinions Concerning Meat Purchases of Others	42
Meat Preparation Practices	46
Meat Dishes Most Often Prepared	46
Preparation Method Used for Certain Meats	48
Homemakers' Knowledge of Meat Cookery Temperatures	50
Meats Avoided Because of Lack of Preparation Knowledge	54
 III. HOMEMAKERS' USES AND REACTIONS TO INFORMATION ABOUT MEAT BUYING 	 55
Use of Information About Meat Buying	55
Use of Newspaper Advertising for Information About Meat Buying	55
Newspapers Checked for Meat Advertisements	58
Use of Store Circulars for Information About Meat Buying	60
Useful Information About Meat Buying (Other than Ads) Read in Newspapers	60
Comparison of Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, on Radio, and on Television	64
Other Sources of Information About Meat Buying	67
Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying	68

CHAPTER	Page
Food Marketing Information Homemakers Think Most Useful	72
News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Useful	73
Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper	76
Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Want	80
IV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	82
Factors Influencing Homemakers' Meat Buying and Preparation Practices	82
Homemakers' Use of Available Information About Meat Buying	92
Homemakers' Interpretation of Information About Meat Buying	97
Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Want	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	104
APPENDICES	107

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Families with Children at Home, Related to Homemakers' Age	8
2	Family Income, Related to Family Size	10
3	Stores in Which Most Family Meat Purchases Were Made	15
4	Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Age	18
5	Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Family Size	19
6	Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Income	20
7	Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Education	20
8	Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Family Size	22
9	Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Income	23
10	Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Age	24
11	Families Eating Meals Away from Home Each Week	25
12	Factors Influencing Beef Purchases	35
13	Reasons for Selection of One Beef Roast Rather than Another of the Same Kind	36
14	Frequency of Purchase of Certain Meat Cuts.....	39

TABLE		Page
15	Temperature, Method or Equipment Used for Cooking Various Meat Cuts	52
16	Homemakers' Use of Meat Advertising in Newspapers, Related to Age	57
17	Homemakers' Use of Meat Advertising in Newspapers, Related to Education	57
18	Homemakers' Use of Meat Advertising in Newspapers, Related to Income	59
19	Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Age	61
20	Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Family Size	62
21	Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Income	63
22	Information About Meat Buying Found Useful, Through Various Media	66
23	Homemakers' Use of Information About Meat Buying Found Through Various Media	67
24	Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying	71
25	News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful	73
26	Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper	77

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

APPENDIX TABLE	Page
1 Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Education	108
2 Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Education	108
3 Rank Given Useful Information About Meat Buying Read in Newspapers, Other than in Ads	109
4 Homemakers' Use of Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than Ads	110
5 Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying, Related to Age	111
6 Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying, Related to Education	112
7 News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful, Related to Age ...	113
8 News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful, Related to Education	114
9 News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful, Related to Income .	115
10 Information Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper, Related to Age	116
11 Information Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper, Related to Education	117
12 Information Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper, Related to Income ..	118

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was planned to learn more about meat buying and preparation practices of urban homemakers. The findings add to present knowledge of consumer food buying behavior and should be of assistance to workers in marketing information for consumers programs. The implications should also be of value to meat producers, processors and retailers.

Since the Michigan marketing program was expanded in 1954, five similar studies have been conducted by the Agricultural Economics Department and the Extension Service of Michigan State University. These studies have made contributions concerning the mass media audience for releases of marketing workers,¹ evaluation of marketing information for institutional food users,² consumer evaluation of food marketing information,³ homemakers' knowledge about food buying and

¹R. E. Borton, "Consumer Use of Mass Media for Food Information" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1957).

²M. D. Boyts, "An Evaluation of Marketing Information for Restaurants, Hospitals and Schools" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1957).

³M. M. Gillespie, "An Evaluation of Selected Releases of Marketing Information for Consumers Prepared by the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1958).

attitudes toward food buying information,¹ and attitudes and approaches of homemakers to food buying.²

A review of literature related to this study indicates many similarities in consumer food buying behavior in different areas of the nation. This was particularly true concerning use of media, food marketing information consumers want, homemaker's level of knowledge of marketing information, influence of store specials, use of shopping lists, sources of food buying information, and the influence of family preference upon the homemaker's choice.

Some of the more recent studies include evaluations of consumer marketing information programs in the Wheeling-Steubenville area³ and Lake Charles, Louisiana.⁴

Particular reference to consumer meat buying practices is shown in three contributions to the southern regional projects concerning

¹M. S. Holmes, "Some Indications of Level of Knowledge and Opinions of Michigan Homemakers About Food Buying" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1958).

²M. D. Zehner, "An Exploratory Study of Consumer Food Buying Decisions, Lansing, Michigan" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1961).

³Ward F. Porter et al., Food Buying--Knowledge--Concerns--Practices (Morgantown: College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, West Virginia University, 1961).

⁴Esther Cooley et al., Informing Consumers in Lake Charles (Baton Rouge: Division of Agricultural Extension, Louisiana State University, 1958).

consumer purchases of beef,¹ motivation and use of poultry,² and meat choices of families in Alabama-Georgia.³

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Show factors influencing homemakers' meat buying and preparation practices.
2. Indicate homemakers' use of available information about meat buying.
3. Determine how effectively homemakers interpret information about meat buying.
4. Determine what information about meat buying homemakers want.

This report is divided into four chapters. Chapter II, titled "Meat Buying and Preparation Practices," deals with factors influencing the selection and use of meat. It concerns homemakers' habits, opinions, and knowledge concerning meat.

Chapter III, titled "Homemakers' Uses, Attitudes and Interpretation of Meat Buying Information," indicates how current sources of information about meat buying are interpreted and used. It also reveals

¹Jessie J. Mize and William C. Stringer, Choosing Beef for Household Use (Athens: College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, 1959).

²Frankye E. Bland and Jessie J. Mize, Consumer Motivation and Use of Poultry (Athens: College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, 1960).

³Mildred S. Van de Mark and Jessie J. Mize, Meat Choices for Family Meals in Selected Cities Alabama-Georgia (Auburn: Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University, 1961).

the kinds of information about meat buying which homemakers think most useful.

Chapter IV summarizes the findings and makes implications concerning their use.

Survey Method and Sample Characteristics

Selection of the Sample

The sample was obtained by selecting from the resident addresses listed in Bresser's Cross-Index Directory for South Oakland County, 1959-1960.¹ A systematic sample with a random start was selected to yield 336 families. The twenty-third resident and every tenth resident thereafter was selected from each of 48 pages for Royal Oak in the directory. Three addresses, one original and two alternates were selected. The resident immediately above the original was listed as the first alternate. The resident immediately below the original was selected as second alternate. If the original was not at home at the time of the first call, neighbors were contacted to determine when the interviewer might find the original at home. If the second call on the original did not yield a response, the interviewer tried the first alternate. For the third call, the interviewer first tried the original

¹Published by the Bresser's Cross-Index Directory Company, Detroit, Michigan.

and then the first alternate. If there was no response, the interviewer then called on the second alternate.

A total of 336 original respondents were selected from 92 streets. Of these, 321 interviews were made. A total of 304 were completed for tabulation and use in this study. The sample included 66 percent original respondents; 23 percent, first alternates; and 11 percent, second alternates.

Background Data

Fourteen women in the Royal Oak vicinity were trained to conduct the 93 question interview. From the period May 2-13, 1960, 280 interviews were completed. The balance of 24 interviews was completed during the following week, May 16-20, 1960. Each interview was approximately one hour in length.

The questionnaire was divided into five parts.¹ The first section checked sources the respondent used for information about meat buying. The second part asked questions to determine homemakers' meat buying and preparation practices and to obtain opinions concerning specific meats.² The third section was planned to determine the homemakers' accuracy in interpreting information about meat

¹ A copy of the complete questionnaire is included in the Appendix B.

² Homemaker or respondent is defined as the person in the family with major responsibility for buying and preparing the food used at home.

buying which might be found in newspaper writing. The fourth section included background information concerning family, age, income, etc. The fifth section asked homemakers to rank information about meat buying they thought most homemakers want.

Description of the Sample

According to city records of January 1960, there were 22,475 resident dwellings in Royal Oak. Of these, 20,669 were single and 1,806 were multiple dwellings. The census reported 3.58 persons per dwelling compared to 3.83 persons per household in Michigan.¹

Age Distribution of the Homemaker

About one-half the sample was made up of homemakers under 40 years of age, with those between 30 to 39 years constituting the largest group. Twelve percent of the homemakers were 60 years of age or older.

The following shows the percentage distribution of homemakers by age:

Under 30	15
30 - 39	34
40 - 49	22
50 - 59	17
60-69	9
70 and over	3

¹U. S. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population: 1960, I.

Size of Households

Family size ranged from one to 11, excluding boarders.¹ Twenty-eight percent of the 304 families consisted of one or two persons, 40 percent had three to four persons, and 33 percent had over four family members.

The sample represented a total of 1,155 family members. Fifty-two percent were adults and 48 percent were children under 18 years of age. Seventy-two percent of the families interviewed had one or more children at home. According to the U. S. census, 64.2 percent of the Royal Oak families had children of their own under 18 years of age and 36.6 percent had children of their own under six years of age.²

Eighty-three percent of the children were located in 66 percent of the families. These families had a total of one to four children at home. Table 1 indicates the families with children at home in relation to homemakers' age.

Eighty-nine percent of the homemakers under 40 years of age had children at home compared with 63 percent of those homemakers between 40 to 60 years of age and 20 percent of the homemakers over 60 years of age.

¹ Household or family is defined as a person living alone or a group of persons who share food supplies.

² Ibid.

Table 1. Families with Children at Home, Related to Homemakers' Age

Number of children at home	Distribution related to age of homemaker			Total sample Percent
	Under 40	40 - 60	Over 60	
	Percent			
1	15	26	14	19
2	27	21	0	21
3	23	6	6	15
4	17	6	0	11
5	4	2	0	3
6	3	1	0	2
7	0	0	0	0
8	0	1	0	0
9	0	0	0	1
None	11	37	80	28
	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	150	118	36	304

Total respondents = 304

Sixty-nine percent of the children resided in homes where the homemakers were under 40 years of age. Twenty-nine percent of the children lived in families where the homemakers were 40 to 60 years of age. Only 2 percent of the children lived in homes where the homemakers were over 60 years of age.

Income of the Household Units

The largest number of families was in the \$5,401 to \$7,000 income level, after deduction of federal taxes. According to the 1960 census, the median Royal Oak family income before federal tax deduction was \$8,184 compared to \$7,576 for Oakland County and \$6,256 for Michigan.¹

The following indicates the percentage distribution of homemakers by income, after deduction of federal taxes:²

Under \$2,000	4
\$2,001 - 4,000	5
\$4,001 - 5,400	11
\$5,401 - 7,000	34
\$7,001 - 10,000	28
Over \$10,000	14
No answer	4

Generally, those families with more family members received higher incomes. Seventy percent of the families with two to three members and 72 percent of the families with four or more members received incomes of between \$5,401 to \$10,000. Only 40 percent of the families of one to two persons received such income. Table 2 shows family income, related to family size.

¹Ibid.

²Family income refers to money income after federal tax deductions of all persons who were members of the family.

Table 2. Family Income, Related to Family Size

Income	Family size			Total sample Percent
	1-2 persons	3-4 persons	Over 4 persons	
	Percent			
Under \$2,000	11	2	0	4
\$2,001 - \$4,000	11	3	4	5
\$4,001 - \$5,400	15	5	10	11
\$5,401 - \$7,000	21	40	38	34
\$7,001 - \$10,000	19	30	34	28
Over \$10,000	15	17	12	14
No answer	8	3	2	4
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	84	123	97	304

Total respondents = 304

Education of the Homemaker

Nine percent of the homemakers had no more than elementary school education, 55 percent had more than elementary but no more than high school education, and 36 percent indicated more than high school education.¹ Six percent had finished eight grades in elementary school, 45 percent had finished high school, and 16 percent had four or more years of college training.

¹Elementary school education is defined as any education below grade nine. High school education is any training in grades nine through 12. More than high school education is any training beyond high school graduation (business school, nurses training, college, etc.).

Occupation of Breadwinner

Approximately 88 percent of the families interviewed indicated that the breadwinner was employed and gave occupation information. Six percent of the respondents were retired, 6 percent declined to give information concerning occupation, and one widow listed herself as unemployed. About 50 percent of breadwinners were employed in occupations demanding special training and skill.

The following shows the percentage distribution of breadwinners' occupations:

Retired	6
Factory worker	9
Construction or laborer, nonfactory	4
High level salesman or business manager	15
Professional	6
Other white collar worker	29
Other blue collar worker	16
Owner or self-employed	9
No answer	6

Employment of Female Homemakers

Seventeen percent of the 299 female homemakers were women employed outside the home. Of these, 50 percent worked full time, 27 percent worked half time, and 23 percent worked less than half time.

The U. S. census indicated that 32 percent of the Royal Oak females 14 years old and over were in the labor force. Twenty-five percent of the married women with husbands present, and 12 percent

with their own children under six were employed.¹

Household Type

Ninety-two percent of the sample consisted of households in which there was a husband and wife. A woman was the only head of the family in 7 percent of the homes. The balance of the sample included two households where a male was sole head, and two households where more than one female shared head responsibility.

This checked closely with that of census reports which showed that 93 percent of the 20, 446 Royal Oak families were headed by a husband and wife.²

Other Characteristics

All respondents in this sample were white. Five respondents interviewed were men, 299 were women.

Indications of Sample Bias

Two differences in data gathered in this survey and in census information indicated sample bias. Seventy-two percent of the sample had one or more children at home compared to 64.2 percent in census reports. Seventeen percent of the female homemakers were employed

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

compared to 25 percent of the married women (with husbands present) reported by the census.

This would indicate that employed wives were more likely to be away from home and were more difficult to contact by the interviewers. The type of sampling followed would allow this type of bias.

compared to 25 percent of the married women (with husbands present) reported by the census.

This would indicate that employed wives were more likely to be away from home and were more difficult to contact by the interviewers. The type of sampling followed would allow this type of bias.

CHAPTER II

MEAT BUYING AND PREPARATION PRACTICES

Part of this study was designed to learn more about the meat buying and preparation practices of urban homemakers.

Meat Buying Practices

Stores in Which Meat Was Purchased

To determine the type of store in which meat purchases were most often made, the respondents were asked to report the kind of store in which they bought most of their meat the last time.

Table 3 shows that 70 percent of the homemakers made most meat purchases in a large grocery store. Approximately 20 percent of the homemakers purchased meat in small neighborhood stores.

A slightly higher percentage of homemakers under 40 years of age purchased meat in more than one store than did those over 40 years of age. All age groups were very similar in the choice of stores in which meat purchases were made. A smaller percentage of homemakers between 40-60 years of age made meat purchases in small size stores than homemakers of other ages.

Homemakers' Reasons for Buying Meat at Stores Where Purchased

The respondents considered the quality available as the most

Table 3. Stores in Which Most Family Meat Purchases Were Made

Stores	Age group			Total sample Percent
	Under 40	40-60	Over 60	
	Percent			
One store				
Small neighborhood store	20	16	22	18
Large store in shopping center	29	30	33	30
Large store not in shopping center	37	41	42	40
Other store	5	6		5
More than one store	8	5	3	6
Have freezer plan	1	2	0	1
	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	150	118	136	304

Total respondents = 304

important reason for buying meat at stores where purchased. Convenience and price ranked second and third as reasons for store loyalty relative to meat purchases.

The following shows homemakers' reasons for buying most of their meat at stores where purchased:

	Percent
Quality	58
Convenience	40
Price or economy	38
Freshness	23
Easy to select	19
Store guarantee or confidence in the store	17

Variety or selection	17
Flavor	9
Store personnel	5

Day of Last Meat Purchase

The respondents were asked on which day they bought meat the previous week or the last time they bought meat. Seventy-three percent of the meat purchases were made on Thursday, Friday or Saturday.

The following shows the day of the last family meat purchase:

	Percent
Monday	4
Tuesday	3
Wednesday	6
Thursday	20
Friday	29
Saturday	25
Sunday	2
No special day	11

Person Making Last Meat Purchase

Approximately two-thirds of the last meat purchases were made by the wife. Less than 20 percent of the last meat purchases were by the wife and husband together or by other family members.

The following indicates the person or persons making the last family meat purchase:

	Percent
Wife alone	66
Husband alone	13
Wife and husband together	16

Daughter	1
Other adult female (unmarried or widow)	3
Have freezer plan instead	1

Amount Spent for Food Used at Home

The respondents were asked to estimate what they spent for food used at home each week.¹ They were reminded to include all purchased food and drinks (excluding alcoholic beverages and soft drinks) used at home during the week preceding the interview. This included purchases made at stores and food and drink delivered to the residence.

Approximately 60 percent of the homemakers spent between \$15.00 to \$30.00 for the food used at home each week. The amount spent was related to the homemaker's age, family size, family income, and education of the homemaker.

Table 4 shows that over 50 percent of the homemakers within each age group spent between \$15.00 to \$30.00 for purchases of food used at home each week. Over one-third of the homemakers under 60 years of age spent over \$30.00 while 40 percent of those over 60 years of age spent less than \$15.00.

¹Food "used" at home includes food eaten, thrown away as waste, or fed to pets. (Pet foods not bought for human consumption are not included.) It includes food served to family members, guests, boarders or hired help or food carried from home in packed meals.

Table 4. Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Age

Expenditure	Age group			Total sample Percent
	Under 40	40 - 60	Over 60	
	Percent			
Under \$15.00	5	11	39	12
\$15.00 - \$30.00	59	56	53	57
Over \$30.00	36	33	8	21
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	150	118	36	304

Total respondents = 304

The weekly food expenditure in relation to family size showed that approximately 70 percent of the families of three to four persons and 50 percent of the families of one to two persons spent between \$15.00 and \$30.00 for food used at home each week. Table 5 indicates that only 41 percent of the families with over four members spent within this price range while over 50 percent spent more. Approximately 40 percent of the families with one to two persons spent under \$15.00 per week compared to 2 and 3 percent in other groups.

Family income influenced the amount spent for food used at home each week. Table 6 shows that approximately 60 percent of the homemakers with over \$5,400 spent between \$15.00 to \$30.00 per week compared to about one-third of those with below \$2,000. From 30 to

Table 5. Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Family Size

Expenditure	Family size			Total sample Percent
	1 - 2 persons	3 - 4 persons Percent	Over 4 persons	
Under \$15.00	39	3	2	12
\$15.00-\$30.00	55	73	41	57
Over \$30.00	6	23	56	21
No answers	0	1	1	0
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	84	123	97	304

Total respondents = 304

40 percent of the homemakers with over \$5,400 income spent over \$30.00 per week compared to 15 to 20 percent in the \$2,001 to \$4,000 income group and none in the lowest income group.

Respondents with education above the elementary grade level were very similar in expenditures for food used at home. Sixty percent of those with more than elementary school education spent between \$15.00 and \$30.00 each week compared with 46 percent of the homemakers with less education. Table 7 indicates that approximately 30 percent of the respondents with more than elementary school education spent over \$30.00 per week for these purchases compared with 15 percent of the homemakers in the lower education group.

Table 6. Weekly Expenditure for Food Used at Home, Related to Income

Expenditure	Income group						Total sample Percent
	Under \$2, 000	\$2, 001- \$4, 000	\$4, 001- \$5, 400	\$5, 401- \$7, 000	\$7, 001- \$10, 000	Over \$10, 000	
	Percent						
Under \$15. 00	64	37	27	7	5	5	12
\$15. 00-\$30. 00	36	44	58	61	55	59	57
Over \$30. 00	0	19	15	32	40	36	21
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
*Number of respondents	11	16	33	103	85	44	304

Total respondents = 304

*4 percent of the sample did not give income.

Table 7. Weekly Expenditures for Food Used at Home, Related to Education

Expenditure	Education group			Total sample Percent
	Less than 9 grades	9 - 12 grades	More than 12 grades	
	Percent			
Under \$15.00	39	9	11	12
\$15.00-\$30.00	46	60	61	57
Over \$ 30.00	15	31	28	21
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	26	169	109	304

Total respondents = 304

Family Meat Expenditure

The respondents were asked to report family meat expenditure for the week prior to the survey.¹ In instances where they could not remember total cost of a cut, prices of the week of the survey were used in estimating expenditure.

Fifty-eight percent of the homemakers reported they had spent less than \$10.00 for meat purchases during the previous week while 38 percent spent more than \$10.00. The amount spent for meat was related to family size, income, and age of the homemaker. The homemaker's education had no apparent influence on the expenditure.²

Table 8 indicates that half the families of less than four persons spent between \$5.00 to \$9.99 for weekly meat purchases. Approximately one-third of the families of over four persons spent within that price range while over one-half of these families spent over \$10.00 per week for meat. Almost 20 percent of the families with over four persons spent over \$15.00 per week for meat.

Income was related to the amount the respondents spent for meat. Although the number of respondents with incomes under \$4,000 was too small to be statistically useful, the results show that 64 percent of those with incomes under \$2,000 and 20 percent of those with incomes

¹Meat expenditures represent total expenditures for purchased red meats, poultry, fish, and other meat products used at home during the week preceding the interview.

²See Appendix A, Table 1.

T

=

—

C

S

S

O

N

I

—

N

X

—

T

S

h

h

3

S

2

h

h

Table 8. Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Family Size

Expenditure	Family size			Total sample Percent
	1 - 2 persons	3 - 4 persons	Over 4 persons	
	Percent			
Under \$5.00	25	9	7	12
\$5.00 - \$9.99	57	51	32	46
\$10.00 - \$14.99	13	25	37	26
Over \$15.00	4	14	19	12
No answers	1	1	5	4
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	84	123	97	304

Total respondents = 304

between \$2,001 to \$4,000 spent less than \$5.00 for family meat purchases the week before the survey. Table 9 shows that 80 to 100 percent within these income groups spent less than \$10.00 per week for meat while only 52 to 64 percent of the families in other income groups spent within that price range.

According to the U. S. Department of Agriculture, a 10 percent difference in income of consumers makes a 1.0 percent difference in the U. S. average quantity of meat consumed at home. This response to income varies from 0.4 percent in the north central region to 2.1

percent in the west.¹

Table 9. Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Income

Expenditure	Income group						Total sample Percent
	Under \$2,000	\$2,001- \$4,000	\$4,001- \$5,400	\$5,401- \$7,000	\$7,001- \$10,000	Over \$10,000	
	Percent						
Under \$5.00	64	20	16	10	8	7	12
\$5.00-\$9.99	36	60	48	42	57	41	46
\$10.00-\$14.99	0	6	26	30	19	34	26
Over \$15.00	0	14	10	15	15	18	12
No answers	0	0	0	3	1	0	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
*Number of respondents	11	16	33	103	85	44	304

Total respondents = 304

*4 percent of sample did not give income.

Table 10 shows that families in which the homemakers were under 60 years of age were very similar in the amounts spent for meat. Over 80 percent of the respondents in these age groups spent less than \$15.00 per week for meat and 12 to 17 percent spent more. Home-

¹U. S. Department of Agriculture, Consumption Patterns for Meat, 1958.

Homemakers over 60 years of age spent significantly less than respondents in other age groups.

Table 10. Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Age

Expenditure	Age group			Total sample Percent
	Under 40	40 - 60	Over 60	
	Percent			
Under \$15.00	84	82	97	84
\$15.00 - \$30.00	12	17	3	13
No answers	4	1	0	3
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	150	118	36	304

Total respondents = 304

Meals Eaten Away from Home

Eighty-three percent of the respondents reported that one or more family members ate one or more meals away from home each week.

Table 11 shows that 72 percent of the families had children who ate lunch away from home and 47 percent of the households reported that the husband ate lunch away from home. Twenty-five percent of the husbands had one or more dinner meals away from home each week and 12 percent of the wives did.

The number of lunches children ate away from home each week varied from one to 20. The following shows the percentage of families

Table 11. Families Eating Meals Away from Home Each Week

Meal	Person	Families	Range in number of meals
	Percent		
Breakfast	Husband	6	1 to 6
	Wife	1	1 to 6
	Others	0	
Lunch	Husband	47	1 to 7
	Wife	8	1 to 7
	Others	72	1 to 20
Dinner	Husband	25	1 to 6
	Wife	12	1 to 7
	Others	6	1 to 4
No meals eaten away from home		17	

Total respondents = 304

reporting and number of lunches children from those families ate away from home each week:

1 to 5 lunches	44
6 to 10 lunches	22
11 to 15 lunches	4
16 to 20 lunches	2

Use of Shopping Lists

Two questions were designed to determine how often the respondents used written shopping lists and the system or order followed in making them.

The homemaker was asked, "In the past year, how often would you say you had a written list before going to shop for groceries?" The responses indicated the following use of shopping lists:

	Percent
Always	52
More than half the time	6
Half the time	5
Less than half the time	7
Never	30

Although only 211 indicated that they used written market lists, 244 voluntarily submitted one. Those who did not have a copy of their last week's shopping list were asked to make a list for the current week.

An analysis of the market lists showed the following listings of the meat order:

	Percent
Specific meats listed by kind and cut	57
Meat order listed as "meat" only	16
No meat listed in the order	13
Meat listed as "meat" and one cut of meat	11
Meat listed as "fish" only	3

Of the 57 percent submitting market orders and listing specific meats by kind and cut, the following placement within the market lists was followed:

	Percent
Meat order at top of the list	19
Meat order listed in one area within the list	16
Meat order listed in two different areas within the list	9
Meat order given at bottom of the list	7

Meats listed more than two places within the list	3
Only meats listed, no other foods shown	3

Fifty percent of the homemakers who usually made a shopping list mentioned the meat order by kind or cut compared with 66 percent of the homemakers who said they never made such a list but submitted one for the interview. Otherwise, the shopping lists of these two groups were very similar. The meat orders were listed as follows:

	Homemakers who usually made shopping lists	Homemakers who said they did not make shopping lists
	Percent	
At top of list	27	24
In one area in the list	15	20
In two areas in the list	14	6
At bottom of list	8	6
More than two places in list	3	0
Only meats listed	4	3

The meat orders of both groups varied from one to eight meat items.

An analysis of the market orders of the 57 percent specifying kinds and cuts of meats showed the following:

	Percent
Beef	70
Ground beef	56
Roasts	27
Steaks	19
Round steak	10
Other beef cuts	13

Pork	66
Bacon	38
Chops	23
Ham	12
Sausage	9
Roast	5
Spareribs	5
Steaks	1
Poultry	46
Chicken	26
Fryers	11
Parts	8
Lamb	6
Veal	7
Fish	21
Tuna	7
Other	40
Luncheon meat	26
Hotdogs, franks, weiners	26
Other specific cuts	1
Roast (unidentified as to kind)	6
Other meat cuts (unidentified as to kind)	10

Influence of Meat Advertisement by Retail Stores

Most retail stores in the area advertise meat features at the end of the week and many of the large chain stores also feature meats each Monday and Tuesday. The respondents were asked whether the store in which they bought the most meat had meat specials the last part of the week.

Seventy percent of the respondents said these stores had meat features at the end of the week. Twenty-five percent said they did not, and 5 percent gave no response.

This would indicate that most homemakers shopping in a large store were aware of the firm's merchandising practices during the last half of the week. The small stores did not advertise special prices at the end of the week, or homemakers shopping in these stores were unaware of such emphasis. Eighty-seven percent of the homemakers aware of meat advertising in stores where they bought most of their meat indicated they were influenced by it. They reported the following frequency of purchase of meat specials:

	Percent
Every week	42
Every two weeks	23
Every three weeks	3
Once a month	5
Hardly ever	14
Never	13

Homemakers' Opinions of Why Stores Feature Certain Meat Cuts

Most homemakers gave more than one reason why they thought stores featured certain meat cuts. They recognized competition between stores and the effort to attract customers through advertising, but only one-third recognized the importance of supply available to meat specials.

The following opinions were given as reasons why stores feature certain meat cuts as specials:

	* Percent
To bring more customers in the store	59
Because meat supplies are plentiful and prices are low	32
Because store could get a large quantity	30
To sell an oversupply which the store has on hand	21
Because store bought it at a low wholesale price	14
Don't know	7
Because quality is inferior	5

*The percentages add to more than 100 because respondents sometimes gave more than one reason.

Influence of Trading Stamps

The respondents were asked to recall whether the store in which they bought the most meat during the last month gave trading stamps. Fifty-three percent answered affirmatively. This group was then asked whether they always took the stamps, and 97 percent indicated that they did.

Although 97 percent of the respondents offered stamps took them, 90 percent of this group said they would continue to buy most of their meat in the same store if the stamps were discontinued. Five percent of this group said they would discontinue buying most of their meat in the same store, while 5 percent said they did not know whether they would or not.

Homemakers' Opinions Concerning Prepackaged Meat

Much of the meat sold in the area is prepackaged. Since

homemakers continue to raise questions concerning prepackaged meat, they were asked to give suggestions for improvement.

The largest number of suggestions for improvement pertained to a desire to see all sides of the package. Over 20 percent expressed satisfaction with present prepackaging of meat while over 10 percent indicated bias against it.

The homemakers listed the following suggestions concerning improvement of prepackaged meats:

	Percent
Wish to see all sides of the package	36
No suggestions, satisfied	22
Want more choice in package size	10
Don't like prepackaged meat	7
Criticism of the cardboard bottom	7
Never use prepackaged meat	6
Should not hide fat	3
Date the packages	3
Not as fresh as other meats	2
Dislike need to rewrap for freezing	1
No comments	3

These figures show that 13 percent of the homemakers expressed bias against use of prepackaged meat. Six percent said they never used it and 7 percent said they did not like it.

The opinions of these homemakers indicate there is room for improvement of prepackaged meats. Greater visibility of product is desired and there could be improvement in size of package to better satisfy customer needs.

Meats Most Frequently Purchased

The respondents were asked to report the kind and cuts of meat purchased when they did their last week's food shopping. Beef was purchased by 91 percent of the families; pork was purchased by 75 percent; and poultry was purchased by 55 percent. Other meats including hot dogs, luncheon meats, and cold cuts were bought by 34 percent of the respondents.

Specific cuts most frequently purchased were: ground beef, 63 percent; chicken, 46 percent; beef roasts, 43 percent; beef steaks, 40 percent; bacon, 33 percent; and pork chops, 31 percent.

The meats which the respondents said they bought the week prior to the survey were classified as follows:

	Percent
Beef	91
Roast	43
Steak	40
Ground beef	63
Stew beef	10
Round steak	7
Beef liver	8
Other beef cuts	9
Pork	75
Bacon	33
Chops	31
Roast	16
Ham	13
Sausage	10
Spareribs (regular)	6
Other pork cuts	11
Veal	11

Lamb	8
Chops	5
Other lamb cuts	5
Poultry	55
Fryers	38
Chicken (unidentified)	18
All other poultry	2
Fish and shellfish	14
Fish (other than shellfish)	10
Shellfish	4
Other meats	34
Hot dogs	22
Lunch meat	17
Other cold cuts	13
All other cuts	6

Following the question relative to meat purchases of the previous week, the respondents were asked to recall the kind and cuts of meat they had bought most often during the past two months.

The recall showed the same high preference for beef cuts and the same order of preference for all other meats, except the various sausages and cold cuts. Apparently, it was difficult for the homemakers to remember specific kinds of sausages and cold cuts, and they failed to relate such purchases of the previous week to those of the past two months.

Homemakers' Reasons for Recent Meat Choices

Ninety-one percent of the respondents gave family preference as the main reason for selecting the meats purchased most often within the

past two months. Price or economy ranked second with 35 percent of the respondents giving this as a main reason for recent meat purchases.

Ten percent of the sample mentioned family health or nutrition as a factor in making meat buying decisions. Eight percent said variety or versatility influenced their meat selections. This would indicate interest in varying meals and interest in meats that serve more than one meal.

Fifteen percent of the respondents indicated that today's homemaker is interested in time saving and convenience. Ten percent of the homemakers selected their recent meat purchases because they were easy to prepare. Another 5 percent selected certain meats because they were quick to prepare.

Factors Influencing Beef Purchases

Since Americans use more beef than any other meat,¹ one question was planned to check homemakers' knowledge of beef quality factors. The respondents were asked, "What do you look for when buying beef?" Most gave two or more answers, and the interviewers recorded answers in the order they were given.

Table 12 indicates the various quality factors the respondents used when buying beef and shows the rank given these. The color of the

¹U. S. Department of Agriculture, A Review of 1955 Survey Data on Household Meat Consumption, 1957.

Table 12. Factors Influencing Beef Purchases

Influencing factor	Rank			Total scores	*Percent of total responses
	1st	2nd	3rd		
Color of lean	69	47	23	139	46
More lean, less fat	63	44	29	136	45
Marbling	43	25	29	97	32
Size of package or piece	24	24	35	84	28
Amount of bone	9	35	18	62	21
Price of package or piece	22	22	17	61	20
Color of fat	3	34	20	57	19
Grade	32	12	11	55	18
Texture	10	9	4	23	8
Thickness or plumpness	2	4	4	10	3
Color of bone	3	3	3	9	3
Firmness	1	2	2	5	2
Label	1	1	0	2	1
Brand	1	0	0	1	0
No answers					1

Total respondents = 304

*Percentages add to more than 100 because more than one influencing factor was sometimes given.

lean, the amount of lean in relation to fat, and marbling were listed as the three major guides. The amount of bone, the size of the package or piece, and the price of the package or piece were other important factors influencing beef purchases.

To further check knowledge of beef quality and to check decision making in the store, the respondents were asked why they might choose one beef roast rather than another of the same kind and cut.

The answers given were much the same as for the previous question, except that the size of the package or piece was the main reason why the homemakers chose one beef roast rather than another. Table 13 shows that 48 percent of the respondents listed this as the main reason, indicating that they think in relation to a particular family's need.

More lean and less fat ranked in second place as before and color of the lean ranked third.

Table 13. Reasons for Selection of One Beef Roast Rather than Another of the Same Kind

Reason	Rank			Total scores	*Percent of total responses
	1st	2nd	3rd		
Size of package or piece	84	34	23	141	48
More lean, less fat	56	43	34	133	45
Color of the lean	42	43	22	107	36
Marbling	28	24	16	68	23
Less bone	11	28	21	60	20
Price of package or piece	11	25	15	51	17
Grade	27	11	7	45	15
Color of the fat	6	14	15	35	12
Texture	8	9	8	25	8
Thickness or plumpness	3	9	2	12	4
Firmness	0	2	0	2	1
Brand	0	0	0	0	0
Label	0	0	0	0	0
No answers					2

Total respondents = 304

*Percentages add to more than 100 because more than one reason was sometimes given.

Reasons for Changing Intended
Meat Purchase in the Store

Although some homemakers read ads and other marketing information, make shopping lists, etc., they often change their minds about meat purchases after reaching the store. Sixty-three percent of the sample reported they had done so recently and gave reasons for changing their intended plan. Quality or appearance factors related to quality, and price constituted the main reasons why homemakers changed intended meat purchases after arrival in the store.

Seventy-seven percent stated that quality of the meat they intended to buy was not up to expectation, that appearance was not up to expectation, or that quality or appearance of another cut in the store looked better.

Price influenced approximately 50 percent of the homemakers who changed their intended meat purchase in the store. Lower price on some other cut, price higher than they expected, or selection of another meat cut featured as a store special that week were reasons concerning price which resulted in a change.

The reasons given for changing the intended meat choice in the store were as follows:

	*Percent
Lower price on some other cut	26
Quality not up to expectations	22
Appearance did not meet expectations	21
Quality of another cut looked better	19
Package size (too large, too small, etc.)	18

Appearance better on some other cut	15
Another cut on "special" chosen instead	14
Display caused a change in mind	10
Price higher than expected	9
Sold out of cut shopper intended to buy	8
Too fat	4
Too much waste	2

*The percentages add to more than 100 because more than one reason was sometimes given

Homemakers' Opinions Concerning Certain Meats

Seven meat cuts, including items bought frequently and infrequently, were chosen to test homemakers' opinions concerning their use.

The respondents were asked to report frequency of purchase of liver, picnic ham,¹ pork shoulder roast, lamb shoulder roast, fish, frying chicken, and hamburger, and were then asked why they did not buy these cuts more often. Table 14 indicates frequency of purchase of the meats as reported by the homemakers.

Ninety percent of the respondents said they bought hamburger more than once a month. Almost 80 percent reported buying frying chicken more than once each month. Sixty percent bought fish and 35 percent bought liver that frequently.

Pork shoulder roast, picnic ham and lamb shoulder roast were bought more than once a month by 8 percent, 7 percent and 6 percent of the respondents, respectively. Seventy-seven percent said they never

¹Picnic ham was the terminology used to help respondents identify this cut. Michigan law requires this cut be labeled picnic.

Table 14. Frequency of Purchase of Certain Meat Cuts

Frequency of purchase	Liver	Picnic ham	Pork shoulder roast	Lamb shoulder roast	Fish	Frying chicken	Hamburger
	Percent						
More than once a month	35	6	7	6	59	79	91
Once a month	17	6	6	3	8	10	5
Once every 2 or 3 months	9	9	6	3	10	5	1
Once every 3 to 6 months	5	4	8	2	3	0	0
Once every 6 to 12 months	7	16	14	7	3	1	0
Never	26	57	58	77	15	4	3
No answer	1	2	1	2	2	1	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Total respondents = 304

bought lamb shoulder roast; 58 percent never bought pork shoulder roast; and 57 percent never bought picnic ham.

The main reasons for not buying liver more often were mostly related to flavor and family preference. Forty-four percent of the respondents said that they disliked the flavor; 14 percent said that one or more family members disliked liver. Nine percent said that they had liver once a week and that was often enough.

Factors related to waste and flavor were the major reasons given by the homemakers for not using picnic ham more often. An enumeration of their reasons follows:

	*Percent
Too much waste	49
Too much fat	28
Dislike flavor	19
Too salty	17
Too large	7
Difficult to carve	5
Prefer other kinds of ham	5
Dislikes	3
Would tire if bought more often	2
Never knew about it	2
Prefer other cuts	1
Health reasons	1

*The percentages add to more than 100 because more than one reason was sometimes given.

Thirty-eight percent of the homemakers listed too much waste as the main reason for not buying pork shoulder roast more often. This would indicate their lack of knowledge that the pork shoulder is the leanest of all pork cuts with bone, or that they are not familiar with the whole Boston butt.

The respondents gave the following reasons for not buying pork shoulder roast more often:

	*Percent
Too much waste	38
Dislike flavor	16
Do not like	10
Too fat	10
Prefer other cuts	8
Health reasons	8
Too large	5
Would tire if bought more often	5
Afraid of pork	2
Too expensive	2

*The percentages add to more than 100 because more than one reason was sometimes given.

The respondents listed flavor as the main reason for not buying lamb shoulder roast more often. Other reasons were minor in comparison. The homemakers' reasons for not buying lamb shoulder roast more often included:

	*Percent
Dislikes flavor	52
Too much waste	14
Some family member dislikes	11
Do not know how to prepare	9
Prefers leg (leg has more lean)	7
Price	6
Too large for the family	3
Difficult to carve	2

*The percentages add to more than 100 because more than one reason was sometimes given.

That meats have diminishing marginal utility with increased use was indicated by the respondents' replies to why they did not use more fish, chicken, and hamburger.

Forty-two percent of the respondents said they would tire of fish if they bought it more often. Nineteen percent said they would tire of chicken if it were bought more often. Another 19 percent said they had chicken often enough, and 13 percent said they had chicken once a week. Twenty-four percent said they did not buy chicken more often because they wanted variety in menus. Sixty-six percent of the respondents said the family would tire of hamburger if it were bought more often, and 26 percent indicated they did not buy it more often because they were seeking variety in meals.

Family preference or bias concerning flavor influenced fish selection as shown by 32 percent of the respondents who said the family did not like fish, and 9 percent who said they disliked fish flavor.

The respondents gave the following reasons for not buying fish more often:

	*Percent
Would tire if bought more often	42
Family does not like fish	32
Does not like to cook fish	11
Dislikes flavor	9
Other miscellaneous reasons	13

*The percentages add to more than 100 because more than one reason was sometimes given.

Homemakers' Opinions Concerning Meat Purchases of Others

Weekly meat orders for four families were presented to the respondents to obtain their opinions relative to cost, preference, nutrition

or meal planning, and personal judgment and acceptance. The homemakers were told that the meat cuts on four cards were bought by four different families during one week. They were asked to study each card and make any comments they wished about each family.

The meat orders were as follows:

Family A - ham, chicken parts, hamburger, beef chuck roast, and beef liver.

Family B - round steak for Swissing, heart, picnic, pork loin roast, and pork sausage.

Family C - T-bone steaks, lamb chops, shrimp, center cut pork chops, frozen-fried chicken, and calf liver.

Family D - pork liver, hamburger, hot dogs, whole fryer, and rib-end pork roast.

The homemakers' expression of opinions concerning the sample meat orders further emphasized the complexity of meat purchase decisions. Certain meat orders were average in cost to some, expensive to others. Meat orders judged a good combination or good planning by certain homemakers were thought poor planning by others. The ability to comment upon meat orders of others related to homemakers' experiences and family preferences.

Twenty-eight percent of the respondents felt that the meat order of Family C was too expensive while only 5 percent felt this meat order that of an average family. Twenty-three percent stated that the meat order of family D was the least expensive and 17 percent listed the meat order of Family C as the most expensive of the four .

The homemakers were more vocal about family preferences concerning the meat order for Family B and Family D than the others. Seventeen percent said the order for Family B would not be their family choice while 11 percent stated the same for the order of Family D. Twelve percent made preference statements concerning liver, 6 percent concerning lamb chops, and 4 percent concerning heart. Eight percent of the respondents stated a preference for fresh rather than frozen fryers. Three percent said they never bought hotdogs.

The homemakers used such words as "variety," "balance," "nourishing," "good menu," and "good diet" to describe their concepts of nutritious well-planned meat orders. Forty-one percent judged the meat order of Family C nutritiously balanced compared to 36 percent for the order of Family A, 8 percent for the order of Family D, and 6 percent for the order of Family B. Thirteen percent said the meat order of Family B and 9 percent said the order of Family D was "not well planned," "not well balanced," or "did not have enough variety."

"Good," "nice," "fine," and "O. K." were words generally used to describe the respondents' personal judgment and acceptance of the various meat orders. Thirteen percent listed the meat order of Family A, and 11 percent listed the meat order of Family D in this regard.

Statements relating to chicken indicate that homemakers were more satisfied with fresh poultry than with the frozen-fried product.

The homemakers' opinions concerning meat purchases of others follow:

	Family list			
	Percent			
	A	B	C	D
Opinions relating to cost				
Low cost, low income, budget minded	14	8		
Average family diet, average shopping list, average people, typical family	5		5	
Chicken parts wasteful, chicken parts more expensive, whole chicken cheaper	4			
Too expensive			28	
Expensive, large income, rich family, cost not important, not trying to save money			17	
Limited budget, skimpy, meager, cheap, below average family, lower income bracket				23
Least expensive				6
Opinions relating to preference				
Just about what I'd buy, similar to own, looks like my list, average family	6			3
Does not like menu, not appealing, wouldn't buy, not for me or us, not my choice		17	4	11
Wouldn't use heart, never buy heart		4		
Leave out lamb chops, like except lamb chops			6	
Would buy fresh chicken, would buy fresh fryer, doesn't buy frozen chicken, doesn't buy frozen meat			8	
Never buys pork liver, no liver, all O. K. , except pork liver, dislike liver	4			8
No hotdogs, don't eat hotdogs				3
Opinions relating to nutrition or meal planning				
Good variety, good balance, good diet, good planning, good menu, good selection	36	6	41	8
Too much pork		46		6
Not enough variety, not well planned, not well balanced, not adequate, not nourish- ing, bad nutrition		13		9
Too much fried food			3	
Opinions relating to personal judgment and acceptance				
O. K. , all right, good, nice, fine	13	2	3	11
Fair, not bad, pretty good	4			3
Bad, not good				4
What families with children buy, lots of children				2

Meat Preparation Practices

Because meat cuts are versatile in use, several questions were designed to learn more about the homemakers' meat preparation practices. The meat dishes most often prepared, cookery methods most often used for certain meat cuts, knowledge of meat cookery temperatures, and meat cuts avoided because of lack of preparation knowledge were checked.

Meat Dishes Most Often Prepared

The respondents were asked, "What meat dishes do you most often prepare for your family?" The answers corresponded with the responses concerning the meats most frequently purchased. Ninety-three percent of the homemakers reported frequent preparation of dishes using beef.

Sixty-eight percent of all the meat dishes listed were made with beef. There were only 25 percent as many pork dishes listed as beef, and only 19 percent as many poultry dishes as beef. Other dishes made with veal, lamb, and fish were negligible in number.

Dishes made with ground beef were listed most frequently by 67 percent of the respondents. Thirty percent of these were dishes with meat balls, 27 percent were meat loaf, 22 percent were hamburgers, 12 percent were casseroles made with hamburger, and 9 percent were chili.

Beef roast ranked second as the meat dish most frequently prepared by 41 percent of the respondents. Pork chops ranked third and was given as the dish most frequently prepared by 23 percent of the respondents. Fried chicken was listed in fourth place by 17 percent of the homemakers.

The meat dishes which the respondents said they most frequently prepared for their families follows:

Meat	Dish	Percent
Beef		93
	Roast	41
	Dishes with meat balls	
	(spaghetti, macaroni, etc.)	20
	Meat loaf	18
	Steak	17
	Hamburgers	15
	Casseroles and variety dishes with hamburger	8
	Stew	7
	Swiss steak	6
	Chili	6
	Beef pie	2
	Goulash	2
	Hash	1
	Round steak (fried)	1
Pork		34
	Chops	23
	Ham	6
	Roast (loin)	5
	Spareribs	2
Veal		3
Lamb		4
Fish and seafood		5
	Tuna casseroles	1

Meat	Dish	Percent
Poultry		32
	Fried chicken	17
	Roast chicken	6
	Chicken (dish unidentified)	2
	Broiled chicken	2
	Chicken soup	1

Preparation Method Used for Certain Meats

The respondents were asked to tell how they most often cooked hamburger, round steak, chuck roast, cured ham, fresh pork roast, pork chops, turkey, and fryers.

Approximately half the homemakers listed frying as the method most frequently used in preparing hamburgers and pork chops.

Forty-eight percent of the respondents gave Swissing as the most frequently used method for round steak preparation while about 20 percent pan-fried this cut.

Eighty percent said they "baked" ham. Twenty-six percent said they "baked" turkey while 63 percent referred to the method as roasting turkey.

Fresh pork roast was cooked in the oven by all those homemakers reporting use of this cut, however, they did not refer to the method as roasting. Chuck roast was prepared in the oven by 42 percent of the respondents compared to 37 percent who prepared it as pot roast.

Forty-six percent of the respondents reported using a frying method for cooking fryers compared to 28 percent who reported "baking" fryers.

The results indicate that the majority of the homemakers used the obvious, most usual methods when preparing these meats. The answers show there is some confusion in preparation terminology, especially between roasting and baking, and in braising. These results should be of value when selecting variations and when developing new recipes using the most frequently used preparation methods for these cuts.

The preparation methods most frequently used for these various meat cuts were as follows:

Cut	Method	Percent
Hamburger	Fry	47
	Broil	16
	Meat loaf	8
	Meat balls	2
	Casseroles	2
Round steak	Swiss	48
	Pan-fry	19
	Tenderize and broil	9
	Oven	4
Chuck roast	Oven	42
	Pot roast	37
Ham (cured)	Bake	80
	Fry	4
	Boil	3
Fresh pork roast	Oven	51
	Bake	2
Pork chops	Fry	50
	Bake	20
	Broil	9
	Breaded	4
	Braise	2

Cut	Method	Percent
Turkey	Roast	63
	Bake	26
Fryer	Fry	44
	Bake	28
	Broil	5
	Barbecue	2
	Deep fat fry	2

Homemakers' Knowledge of Meat Cookery Temperatures

The homemakers' knowledge of meat cookery temperatures was checked for nine meat cuts. They were asked to tell the approximate temperature used when cooking chuck roast, round steak, hamburger, fresh pork roast, pork chops, cured ham, turkey, fryers, and fish. There was a wide range of temperatures given for each meat cut. Rather than reporting exact temperature, some respondents estimated the temperature using such words as "high," "medium," "low," etc. Others reported the part of the range or equipment used for cooking these meats. Depending upon the cut, 10 to 20 percent of the respondents stated they did not know the approximate temperature they used for the nine meat cuts.

Depending upon the cut, 35 to 86 percent of the homemakers gave exact cooking temperatures for the various cuts. A larger percentage of exact temperatures were stated for cured ham, turkey, chuck roast, and fresh pork roast. A larger percentage of approximate temperatures were given for hamburger, round steak, fish, pork chops, and fryers.

The respondents reported using 350 degrees Farenheit for cooking the various meat cuts more often than any other temperature.¹

This was followed by 325 degrees and 350-400 degrees.

Table 15 shows that less than half the respondents reported using the suggested temperature range of 300-325 degrees for meat cookery.²

Forty-two percent reported using these temperatures for turkey and cured ham; 30 percent, beef chuck; 25 percent, fresh pork roast; 12 percent, pork chops; and 10 percent, fryers.

Most homemakers cooked these meats at temperatures above 325 degrees. Approximately 40 percent cooked fryers, cured ham, beef chuck, and turkey at higher temperatures. Fresh pork roast, fish, pork, round steak, and hamburgers were cooked at temperatures over 325 degrees by approximately 30 percent of the sample.

These answers indicate that approximately half the respondents lacked basic meat cookery knowledge. This is shown by the following:

- a) depending upon the cut, 10 to 20 percent said they did not know the temperature they used,
- b) many did not relate the temperature used for cooking one meat cut with that used for other meat cuts,
- c) 20 to 40 percent, depending upon the cut, reported use of temperatures over 350 degrees, and

¹Cooking temperature refers to the Farenheit scale.

²Temperature recommended by Department of Animal Husbandry, Michigan State University.

Table 15. Temperature, Method or Equipment Used for Cooking Various Meat Cuts

Temperature, method or equipment	Cut								
	Chuck roast	Round steak	Hamburger	Fresh pork roast	Pork chops	Cured ham	Turkey	Fryers	Fish
	Percent								
Exact temperature									
225°-300°	4	5	1	3	4	4	6	2	1
300°	9	2	0	9	6	16	17	3	0
300°-325°	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	1	3
325°	21	2	4	17	6	26	25	6	3
325°-350°	0	0	0	3	4	0	1	2	0
350°	29	10	10	25	16	32	27	20	9
350°-400°	9	7	8	4	3	4	5	14	9
400°-500°	0	1	1	0	1	4	4	6	8
450°-550° broil	0	5	7	0	3	0	0	1	3
400°, to lower	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
425°, and lower	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	72	35	35	72	43	86	85	55	36
Approximate temperature									
High	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	2
High, then lower	0	8	2	2	3	0	0	5	5
Medium	0	10	19	1	10	0	0	9	11
Medium, then low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Low, slow, simmer	0	8	7	3	9	0	0	6	5
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	0	26	30	6	23	0	0	22	24

Table 15. (Continued)

Temperature, method or equipment	Cut								
	Chuck roast	Round steak	Hamburger	Fresh pork roast	Pork chops	Cured ham	Turkey	Fryers	Fish
	Percent								
Method or equipment used									
Pressure cooker	1	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Oven	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Surface burner	11	10	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
Grill	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deep fat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Pan-fry	0	2	10	0	4	0	0	3	8
Broil	0	1	6	0	4	0	0	3	3
Sear and steam	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Boil	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	12	16	17	2	17	2	0	10	13
Miscellaneous answers	2	4	1	0	1	1	1	2	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2	4	1	0	1	1	1	2	0
Other comments									
Never use	0	3	2	9	2	0	0	1	7
Do not know	14	16	15	11	14	11	14	10	20
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	14	19	17	20	16	11	14	11	27
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Total respondents = 304

- d) less than half reported use of 300-325 degree temperatures for the various cuts.¹

Meats Avoided Because of Lack
of Preparation Knowledge

The respondents were asked, "Are there cuts or kinds of meat you avoid because you are not sure about how to prepare them?" The organ meats of beef, pork, lamb, and veal were most often listed.

The meats homemakers avoided because of lack of preparation knowledge were as follows:

Meat	Cut	Percent
Beef	Heart	7
	Kidney	6
	Flank	5
	Tongue	4
	Liver	4
	Brains	3
	Tripe	2
	Corned beef	2
Pork	Kidney	3
	Heart	2
	Brains	2
Veal	Sweetbreads	11
	Kidney	3
	Heart	2
Lamb	All cuts	8
	Leg	5
	Breast	3
	Heart	2

¹ Meat cooked at 300-325 degrees temperature results in a finished product with less shrinkage or weight loss, more uniform doneness, that is easier to carve, and that has better flavor.

CHAPTER III

HOMEMAKERS' USES AND REACTIONS TO INFORMATION ABOUT MEAT BUYING

Part of this study was planned to determine the sources homemakers used for information about meat buying with emphasis directed to use of store advertising and mass media. Those receiving information about meat buying through various media were checked to determine application of such information.

One question was designed to determine accuracy with which the respondents interpreted news writing on meat grades, cost comparison, seasonality, and outlook. Three questions were planned to discover homemakers' opinions concerning information on meat buying that they judged useful, would look for if they knew it was in the newspaper, and thought other homemakers want.

Use of Information About Meat Buying

Use of Newspaper Advertising for Information About Meat Buying

Homemakers were asked how often they checked store advertising in newspapers before buying meat. Sixty-two percent of the respondents said they always checked store advertising before buying meat while 27 percent said they never did. An additional 3 percent reported they

checked meat advertising in newspapers more than half the time, another 2 percent about half the time, and the final 6 percent less than half the time.

Tabulation of data relating to age, education, and income shows that slightly more homemakers over 40 years of age always checked store advertising of meat than did those in other age groups. A higher percentage of those with elementary education always checked than did those in other education groups. Those homemakers with higher incomes checked advertisements less frequently than others.

Comparison between age groups indicates that a slightly higher percentage of homemakers over 40 years of age always checked newspaper advertising before buying meat than those under 40 years of age. Table 16 shows that 31 percent of the homemakers over 60 years of age said they never used this source of information about meat buying compared to 24 to 27 percent of the homemakers in other age groups.

A check of the homemakers' education indicated that a higher percentage of those with elementary education read newspaper advertisements than homemakers in other education groups. Table 17 shows that those with high school education and those with more than high school education were very similar in response to this question.

Approximately 10 percent of those with elementary education reported that they never read meat advertisements in newspapers compared with about 30 percent in the other groups.

Table 16. Homemakers' Use of Meat Advertising in Newspapers, Related to Age

Use	Age group			Total sample Percent
	Under 40	40 - 60	Over 60	
	Percent			
Always	60	63	69	62
More than half the time	3	5	0	3
Half the time	3	2	0	2
Less than half the time	7	6	0	6
Never	27	24	31	27
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	150	118	36	304

Total respondents = 304

Table 17. Homemakers' Use of Meat Advertising in Newspapers, Related to Education

Use	Education group			Total sample Percent
	Less than 9 grades	9 - 12 grades	More than 12 grades	
	Percent			
Always	85	64	63	62
More than half the time	0	2	2	3
Half the time	0	2	1	2
Less than half the time	4	5	5	6
Never	11	27	29	27
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	26	169	109	304

Total respondents = 304

This study shows that homemakers in higher income levels used store ads less frequently than others for information about meat buying. Table 18 shows that only 46 percent of those with incomes over \$10,000 had checked meat advertising within six weeks prior to the survey compared to 82 percent of the homemakers with incomes of \$2,001 to \$4,000. Others reading meat advertising for meat buying information ranged from 58 percent of those with incomes from \$7,001 to \$10,000 to 68 percent of those with incomes from \$5,401 to \$7,000.

Those with income under \$2,000 were quite different from those in the next higher income group. Sixty-four percent of the lower income group said they read advertisements for information about meat buying compared to 82 percent in the next income level. Twenty-seven percent of the lowest income group said they never read meat ads compared to only 6 percent in the next income level. This wide difference could be due to several reasons particular to this low income group where:

- a) little meat was bought,
- b) few alternative choices were possible, and
- c) the meat order varied little from one week to another.

Newspapers Checked for Meat Advertisements

The homemakers were asked, "If you have checked meat advertising within the last six weeks, in which papers did you find it?"

Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated they had checked meat advertising in newspapers within that time period. Almost 60

Table 18. Homemakers' Use of Meat Advertising in Newspapers, Related to Income

Use	Income group						Total sample Percent
	Under \$2,000	\$2,001-\$4,000	\$4,001-\$5,400	\$5,401-\$7,000	\$7,001-\$10,000	Over \$10,000	
	Percent						
Always	64	82	67	68	58	46	62
More than half the time	0	6	0	3	5	2	3
Half the time	0	6	6	2	1	2	2
Less than half the time	9	0	0	6	7	9	6
Never	27	6	27	21	29	41	27
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
*Number of respondents	11	16	33	103	85	44	304

Total respondents = 304

*4 percent of sample did not give income.

percent of this group found it in the local newspaper. Newspapers checked by 73 percent of the homemakers for meat buying information included:

	Percent
<u>The Daily Tribune</u> , Royal Oak	59
<u>The Detroit News</u>	40
<u>The Detroit Free Press</u>	20
<u>The Detroit Times</u>	12

Forty-three percent of all the homemakers in this survey had checked meat advertising within the six weeks prior to the survey in The Daily Tribune, 30 percent in The Detroit News, 14 percent in The Detroit Free Press, and 9 percent in The Detroit Times.

Use of Store Circulars for
Information About Meat Buying

Seventy-two percent of the respondents said they had read meat advertising in store circulars within six weeks prior to the survey.

Those mentioned most often included four chain stores located in the area. Food Fair was mentioned 54 times, Kroger was listed 17 times, and Wrigley and A. & P. were listed 14 times each.

Useful Information About Meat Buying
(Other than Ads) Read in Newspapers

The homemakers were asked, "Within the last six weeks, have you read any useful information about meat buying in papers other than that carried in the ads?" Forty-eight percent replied affirmatively.

Sixty percent of the respondents reading useful information about meat buying in newspapers, other than in ads, found it in the local newspaper.¹ Fifty percent said they found the information in The Detroit News, 32 percent in The Detroit Free Press, 13 percent in The Detroit Times, and 4 percent in other papers.²

Generally, a higher percentage of homemakers under 60 years of age, in families of over two persons, with higher than elementary education, and with incomes over \$5,400 read useful information about meat buying in newspapers.

¹ The Daily Tribune, Royal Oak.

² The Detroit News later bought The Detroit Times.

Table 19 shows that half the homemakers under 60 years of age reported reading useful information about meat buying prior to the survey. Only one-third of those over 60 years of age had read such information.

Table 19. Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Age

Reading useful information	Age group			Total sample
	Under 40	40 - 60	Over 60	
	Percent			Percent
Yes	51	51	34	48
No	39	42	58	44
No answer	10	7	8	8
	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	150	118	36	304

Total respondents = 304

Table 20 indicates that one-third of the respondents in families of one to two persons had found useful information about meat buying in newspapers prior to the survey. Over half the respondents in larger size families had found such information.

Approximately 40 percent of the homemakers with elementary school education had found useful information about meat buying in newspapers compared with 50 percent of those with more education.¹

¹ See Appendix A, Table 2.

Table 20. Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Family Size

Reading useful information	Family size			Total sample Percent
	1-2 persons	3-4 persons	Over 4 persons	
	Percent			
Yes	33	55	55	48
No	63	42	40	44
No answer	4	3	5	8
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	84	123	97	304

Total respondents = 304

Table 21 indicates that approximately 50 percent of all the respondents, except those in the \$4,001 to \$5,400 group and those with less than \$2,000 income, read useful information about meat buying in newspapers. Only 39 and 36 percent of these respective groups had.

A larger percentage of homemakers within the \$2,001 to \$4,000 income level reported using meat advertising and reading other useful information about meat buying found in newspapers than did homemakers in the income groups immediately above or below. This would indicate that homemakers in this income range are consciously seeking information about meat to assist with planning and buying decisions.

Those respondents finding useful information about meat buying

Table 21. Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Income

Reading useful information	Income group						Total sample Percent
	Under \$2, 000	\$2, 001-\$4, 000	\$4, 001-\$5, 400	\$5, 401-\$7, 000	\$7, 001-\$10, 000	Over \$10, 000	
	Percent						
Yes	36	56	39	52	51	50	48
No	55	38	55	45	42	46	44
No answers	9	6	6	3	7	4	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
*Number of respondents	11	16	33	103	85	44	304

Total respondents = 304

*4 percent of sample did not give income.

in newspapers within six weeks prior to the survey were asked to classify it as to type and usefulness.

Most homemakers listed more than one type of information as useful.¹ Fifty-three percent thought price the most useful information while 36 percent listed information about supply as useful. Information on selection was judged useful by 23 percent, and 22 percent thought information about grade useful. Information about preparation or use was listed by 15 percent of these homemakers and information about meat cuts was scored by 11 percent.

¹See Appendix A, Table 3.

These results do not specifically indicate the respondents' preferences as to kinds of information about meat buying they want in newspapers, only what they found to be useful. These answers were dependent upon the information made available by news editors and consumer marketing information agents during the period before the survey.

After the respondents classified news information about meat buying according to usefulness, they were asked how they applied this information. Interviewers recorded answers in the order given, and most homemakers listed more than one use.

Fifty - two percent of the homemakers reading such information in newspapers said they used it in planning before going to the store.¹ Use as a guide to economy or thrift was scored by 39 percent of the group. Use in selection at the store, as an addition to the homemakers' knowledge, and in preparation or use at home were given as applications of the information by 22, 19, and 16 percent of these respondents, respectively.

Comparison of Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, on Radio, and on Television

Since effectiveness of various methods of reaching consumers is of value to extension workers, retailers, and others, checks were made of homemakers' use of newspaper, radio, and television.

¹See Appendix A, Table 4.

Following the questions relative to newspapers, the respondents were asked, "Within the last six weeks, have you heard any information about meat buying on radio?" They were then asked what information they heard, what was most useful, and how they had used the information. The same questions were repeated concerning television viewing.

Generally, a larger percentage of homemakers said they used newspapers for information about meat buying than the other media. Forty-eight percent of the homemakers indicated they had read useful information about meat buying in newspapers. Eighteen percent reported they had seen useful information about meat buying on television and 14 percent indicated they had heard useful information about meat buying on radio.

Information on price was judged the most useful information about meat buying gained through all media. Supply information ranked second in usefulness and information on selection ranked third.

Table 22 shows that while price information was important to half or more of the homemakers reached by these media, supply information was voted useful by about one-third. Selection and preparation or use were listed by approximately 20 percent of these respondents. Grade information was deemed useful by about 15 percent of those reading newspapers and seeing meat buying information on television, and to 30 percent of those hearing such information on radio. About

Table 22. Information About Meat Buying Found Useful, Through Various Media

Information found useful	Media					
	Newspaper		Radio		Television	
	Readers Percent	Total sample	Listeners Percent	Total sample	Viewers Percent	Total sample
Price	53	26	67	9	49	8
Supply	36	17	35	5	33	6
Selection	23	11	21	3	22	4
Preparation or use	22	10	16	2	24	4
Grade	15	7	30	4	13	2
Cuts	11	3	9	1	29	5
Other	0	0	12	2	0	0
Number of respondents	148	304	43	304	55	304

Total respondents = 304

10 percent listed information on meat cuts useful in newspapers and on radio while about 30 percent of those viewing such information on television listed it as useful.

When asked how they had used information about meat buying found through various media, the respondents listed planning before going to the store the main use for all media. Table 23 shows that the home-makers ranked guide to economy or thrifty choice second on all media. Use in selection at the store was scored third for those finding such information in newspapers and on radio, and use in preparation was ranked third by those viewing television.

Table 23. Homemakers' Use of Information About Meat Buying Found Through Various Media

Use of information	Media					
	Newspaper		Radio		Television	
	Readers	Total sample	Listeners	Total sample	Viewers	Total sample
	Percent		Percent		Percent	
In planning before going to store	52	25	47	15	16	5
As a guide to economy or thrifty choice	39	16	37	12	16	5
In selection at the store	22	7	19	6	6	2
Just added to homemaker's knowledge	19	6	19	6	6	2
In preparation or use at home	16	5	12	4	13	4
In care at home	5	2	5	2	0	0
Other	3	1	0	0	0	0
Number of respondents	148	304	43	304	55	304

Total respondents = 304

Other Sources of Information
About Meat Buying

Since homemakers use sources other than media for information about meat buying, they were asked to indicate those used within the last two or three months. Eight-three percent of the respondent said

they had used the following:

	Percent
Store displays of meat	52
Friends and neighbors	46
Labels on meat	34
Magazines	25
Manager or clerks in store	25

The results indicate the importance of the store in providing information about meat buying. The prepackaged store display presently shows name of the cut, net weight of the package, price per pound, and the total cost of the package. Brand and other information is often given.

One-fourth of the respondents, using sources other than mass media for information about meat buying, said they had received information from the manager or store clerks. This implies that a number of meat shoppers want further information or want merchandise in addition to that found in meat displays.

Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying

Four paragraphs on seasonality, grades, cost comparison, and outlook were prepared to check the respondents' accuracy in interpreting information about meat buying which they might read in the newspaper. The paragraphs read as follows:

1) SEASONAL -- Steak prices may be as much as 15 to 30 cents per pound higher in midsummer than in midwinter. Two important reasons for this are that there are fewer steaks available in summer, and more shoppers wanting them make supplies still smaller.

2) GRADES -- All beef is not federally graded, but if the grade is found on the cut or package, it is a guide to tenderness and flavor. U. S. Prime beef is the top quality. U. S. Choice beef is of high quality and usually has less fat than Prime beef. U. S. Good grade beef pleases thrifty shoppers who seek beef with little fat but of fairly good quality.

3) COST COMPARISON -- You'll want to compare more than price per pound when buying ham. Canned ham, with no bone, will serve four persons from each pound. Whole ham, with the skin and most of the outside fat removed, will serve two and one-half to three portions per pound. A half of ham will yield two and one-half servings per pound. A portion of ham, with the center slices removed, will yield two servings per pound. Price per serving tells how far your ham dollar will go.

4) OUTLOOK INFORMATION -- During the first three months of 1960 pork supplies will be 2 percent larger than a year earlier. During the rest of 1960, pork supplies will be smaller than a year ago, and shoppers can expect higher pork prices.

Answers were scored correct when the respondent repeated the information as it was given in the paragraph, or correctly related the information to his buying decisions. Answers were scored partly correct when the respondent repeated part of the information, or showed some knowledge of its use. Answers were scored incorrect when the respondent failed to answer the question, failed to repeat any of the information given in the paragraph, or failed to relate it to his buying decisions.

The cost comparison information was correctly interpreted by a larger percentage of the respondents than were other types of information. This was true regardless of age or education, with the exception of those with less than high school education. Almost equal percentages of the respondents correctly interpreted outlook and grade information, while a smaller percentage correctly interpreted the paragraph of seasonal information.

Table 24 indicates that 45 percent of the homemakers correctly interpreted cost comparison information while only 26 percent correctly interpreted seasonal information. Cost comparison information was scored correct or partly correct by 79 percent of the respondents compared to 76 percent for grades, 71 percent for seasonal, and 64 percent for outlook. Thirty percent of the sample incorrectly interpreted outlook information compared to 16 to 25 percent for the other types of information.

Table 24. Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying

Interpretation	Type of information			
	Seasonal	Grade	Cost comparison	Outlook
	Percent			
Correct	26	33	45	38
Partly correct	45	43	34	26
Incorrect	25	18	16	30
No answers	4	6	5	6
Total	100	100	100	100

Total respondents = 304

A study of homemakers' interpretations related to age shows that 39 to 47 percent of the homemakers correctly interpreted cost comparison information with those under 40 years of age scoring more accurately than those in other age groups.¹ Thirty six to 39 percent of the respondents correctly judged outlook information with those in the 40 to 60 year age group accurate most often. Twenty-eight to 38 percent of the homemakers correctly interpreted grade information, and those under 40 years of age scored most accurately. Only 24 to 28 percent of the respondents correctly interpreted the paragraph of seasonal information, and those under 40 years of age were accurate most often.

¹See Appendix A, Table 5.

A tabulation of results relating to education shows that respondents with elementary school education had most difficulty with interpretation of the four types of information.¹ Only 15 to 19 percent of this group gave correct interpretations compared to 28 to 42 percent of those with high school training, and 26 to 54 percent of those with more than high school education.

Food Marketing Information Homemakers
Think Most Useful

Three questions were planned to determine the information about meat buying the respondents felt most useful.

After the respondents completed interpretation of the four paragraphs of information on seasonality, grades, cost comparison, and outlook, they were asked to rank the information in the order in which they found it most useful. Following this, they were asked which of these releases they would look for if they knew they were in the paper.

The third question was given at the conclusion of the interview. The interviewer explained that one purpose of the survey was to find what information homemakers would like to know about meat. The respondents were given twelve cards with statements relative to meat and asked to select six which they felt homemakers would like to know more about. They were then asked to rank the cards in order, one through six.

¹See Appendix A, Table 6.

News Information About Meat Buying
Which Homemakers Think Useful

When the homemakers were given a choice between kinds of information about meat buying they felt most useful, the paragraph on grade ranked first. Cost comparison information ranked second, seasonality third, and outlook information fourth.

Table 25 shows that 37 percent of the respondents listed information on grades in first place. This compared to 28 percent for cost comparison information, 21 percent for seasonal information, and only 8 percent for outlook information.

Table 25. News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful

Rank	Type of information			
	Seasonal	Grade	Cost comparison	Outlook
	Percent			
1 st	21	37	28	8
2nd	19	23	35	13
3rd	34	19	19	19
4th	16	15	9	50
No answer	10	6	9	10
Total	100	100	100	100

Number of respondents = 304

When first and second places were combined, scores for information on cost comparison and grades were very similar. Only two-thirds as many ranked seasonal information in the first two places and only one-third as many ranked outlook information in these places. Fifty percent of the homemakers ranked outlook information in fourth place.

Comparisons between age groups showed that homemakers under 40 years of age listed cost comparison information most useful.¹ Homemakers 40 to 60 years of age and those over 60 listed grade information most useful. Cost comparison information was listed in first place by 32 percent of the homemakers under 40 years of age, while about 40 percent of the homemakers in the other age groups listed grades in first place. Seasonal information was ranked third in usefulness by 29 percent of those under 40 years of age, by 38 percent of those between 40 to 60 years, and by 39 percent of those over 60.

The respondents with high school education ranked grade information of greatest value. Those with more than high school training ranked information on grades, cost comparison, and seasonality about equal in usefulness. Those with elementary school education ranked information on cost comparison most useful. Forty-three percent of the homemakers with high school education ranked grade information

¹See Appendix A, Table 7.

most useful while 42 percent with elementary school education ranked cost comparison information of greatest value.¹ Twenty-nine percent of the respondents with more than high school education ranked cost comparison information first, 28 percent ranked grade information first, and 28 percent voted seasonal information first. Forty-six percent of the respondents with elementary school education placed seasonal information third in usefulness compared with 32 percent of those with high school education and 34 percent of those with more training. Outlook information was voted least useful by 25 percent of the homemakers with more than high school education, 52 percent of those with high school education, and 58 percent of those with elementary school education.

Homemakers of all income groups judged cost comparison information very useful with the exception of those with income under \$2,000.² Only 18 percent of the homemakers in this income group judged cost comparison information in first and second places compared with 59 to 75 percent of homemakers in other groups. Fifty-five percent of the homemakers in the lowest income group scored seasonal information in first and second place compared to 39 to 44 percent of the homemakers in other groups. Grade information was judged most useful by the

¹ See Appendix A, Table 8.

² See Appendix A, Table 9.

homemakers in the lowest income group with 64 percent scoring it in first and second place. Eighty-one percent of the homemakers in the \$2,001 to \$4,000 income range voted information on grades in first and second place compared to 49 to 68 percent of the homemakers in higher income groups.

Information About Meat Buying Homemakers
Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the
Newspaper

After the homemakers ranked information on seasonality, grades, cost comparison, and outlook in order of usefulness, they were asked which releases they would look for if they knew they were in the paper. This question was similar to the one preceding it and was planned to determine the homemaker's interest in such food information.

The homemakers again rated grades and cost comparison information higher than other types of information. Seasonal information ranked third, and there was least interest in outlook information. Table 26 shows that 31 percent of the respondents ranked cost comparison information in first place compared to approximately 25 percent for grade and seasonal information and only 12 percent for outlook information.

Addition of the first and second places shows that 58 percent of the homemakers ranked cost comparison information in these places compared to 51 percent for grade information and 41 percent for seasonal

information. Only 29 percent ranked outlook information in these places and 40 percent placed it in fourth place. From 11 to 18 percent said they would not read this kind of information if they knew it was in the paper.

Table 26. Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper

Rank	Type of information			
	Seasonal	Grade	Cost comparison	Outlook
	Percent			
1st	24	25	31	12
2nd	17	26	27	17
3rd	31	20	19	13
4th	13	18	9	40
Would not read	15	11	14	18
Total	100	100	100	100

Number of respondents = 304

A higher percentage of homemakers under 40 years of age were interested in the four types of information than those in other age groups.¹ Homemakers over 60 years of age showed less interest in outlook information than did those of other ages. The scores between cost comparison and grade information were close in all age groups. Sixty

¹See Appendix A, Table 10.

percent of the homemakers between 40 to 60 years of age ranked cost comparison in first and second place compared with 59 percent in the younger age group and 48 percent in the older age group. Sixty-four percent of the respondents over 60 years of age scored grade information in first and second place compared with 52 percent in the 40 to 60 year age group and 46 percent in the group under 40 years of age.

Tabulations relating to education also showed that homemakers were more interested in reading information on cost comparison or grades, than on seasonality or outlook.¹ A higher percentage of homemakers with elementary school education said they would look for cost comparison and grade information than homemakers with higher education. A higher percentage of homemakers with more than high school education said they would look for seasonal and outlook information than those in other groups. Homemakers with elementary school education indicated least interest in seasonal and outlook information.

Comparisons relating to income show that a larger percentage of homemakers in each income group said they would look for information on cost comparison and grades than for information on seasonality or outlook.² Homemakers with less than \$2,000 income were more interested in seasonal information than homemakers in other income groups.

¹See Appendix A, Table 11.

²See Appendix A, Table 12.

A higher percentage of homemakers in the \$4,000 to \$10,000 income range ranked cost comparison information in first and second place than grade information.

Forty-three percent of the homemakers with incomes over \$10,000 listed cost comparison information in first and second place while 49 percent ranked grade information in these places. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents with \$2,001 to \$4,000 income listed cost comparison information in first and second place while 81 percent ranked grade information in first and second place. Only 9 percent of the homemakers in the lowest income level ranked cost comparison information in first and second place compared with 55 percent for grade information. Sixty-four percent of the homemakers in the lowest income group placed seasonal information in first and second place. Twenty-seven percent of the homemakers in the lowest income group and 21 to 23 percent of the homemakers in the highest income group said they would not read this type of information. A smaller percentage of respondents with incomes between \$2,001 to \$7,000 said they would not read the various kinds of information than homemakers in lower or higher income groups.

These results imply that young homemakers are interested in these types of information about meat buying. However, less interest was shown in outlook than the other information. One reason could be

the homemaker's inability to relate outlook information to supply and price. Another reason might be that homemakers are primarily interested in the current food situation, not that of future months. Homemakers in the lower income groups were very conscious of seasonal supplies. Perhaps their experience in shopping within a low budget helped them relate seasonality to availability and price.

Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Want

In order to determine information about meat buying homemakers want, the respondents were given twelve cards with statements relative to meat. They were asked to choose six which they thought homemakers would like to know more about and rank them in order of importance.

Approximately two-thirds of the homemakers indicated that how to cook meat was a primary concern. Suggestions on how to spend less money for meat and comparing costs between meat cuts was judged important by about 60 percent, respectively. Factors relating to selection, care and supplies for the current week were other areas of interest to these homemakers.

The meat information which the respondents felt homemakers would like to know more about included:

	Percent
How to cook different meat cuts	66
Suggestions on how to spend less money for meat	61

	Percent
Comparing cost between different cuts of meat	57
Learning to recognize different meat cuts	54
How to choose or select beef, pork, veal, lamb, etc.	51
Meat grades and what they mean	51
Proper care of meat in the refrigerator and freezer	51
Information on meat supplies for the week	49
Changes in meat supplies expected in the next few weeks	34
Suggestions for buying meat for the freezer	32
Reasons why meat prices and supplies change	26

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This research was undertaken to increase present knowledge of the meat buying and preparation practices of urban Michigan homemakers. One section of the study was devoted to determining factors influencing homemakers' selection and use of meat. A second part was planned to determine homemakers' interpretations and uses of available information about meat buying. Other questions were asked to learn the kinds of information about meat buying homemakers want. The respondents were asked to select information about meat buying they considered most useful and to rank information they thought other homemakers would like to know more about.

The study was designed to provide further information for workers in marketing information for consumers programs and others interested in meat buying and preparation practices.

Factors Influencing Homemakers' Meat Buying and Preparation Practices

1. A study of the buying practices of the 304 homemakers interviewed revealed that 74 percent made their family meat purchases on Thursday, Friday or Saturday. Seventy percent bought most of their meat in a large food store and 66 percent shopped alone.

The quality available was given as the reason for selecting meat at stores where purchased by 58 percent of the homemakers. Forty percent stated these stores were convenient, while 38 percent mentioned price or economy as another reason for store loyalty.

Homemakers' recall of meats purchased the week prior to the survey indicated that approximately half were beef cuts. Sixty-three percent reported buying ground beef; 56 percent, chicken; 43 percent, beef roast; 40 percent, beef steak; 33 percent, bacon; and 31 percent, pork chops.

Approximately 60 percent of the families spent from \$15.00 to \$30.00 weekly for food prepared at home. Forty-six percent of the families spent between \$5.00 to \$9.99 for meat purchases. Eighty-three percent of the families reported that one or more members ate meals away from home during the week. These data indicated that family characteristics of income and size, and age of the homemaker influenced these expenditures.

These findings suggest that weekly information about meat buying would be of greater value to homemakers if received before the three major shopping days. This would apply to individuals, organizations or firms wishing to reach consumers with such information.

Those providing information about meat for consumers might give more program emphasis to kinds and cuts of meat most frequently purchased.

The homemakers' willingness or desire to buy in stores which sold "quality meat" is important to firms selling meat. Maintaining a store image for quality meat would be helpful in securing and keeping customers.

2. The kinds of meat dishes prepared correlated with the kinds of meats the homemakers purchased. When asked to list meat dishes most frequently prepared, 68 percent were made with beef.

Various dishes made with ground beef were listed by 67 percent of the homemakers. These included dishes with meat balls, 30 percent; meat loaf, 27 percent; hamburgers, 22 percent; casseroles, 12 percent; and chili, 9 percent.

Beef roast was listed as a frequently prepared dish by 41 percent, pork chops by 23 percent, and fried chicken by 17 percent.

Since beef was the meat most frequently used, perhaps more emphasis could be devoted to recipe development using this meat. New and improved recipes for use of ground beef and cooked beef roast would possibly increase consumer satisfaction in use of beef. Other recipes using chicken and pork chops would provide menu variety in which homemakers stated an interest. Information on selection and preparation of meat cuts less frequently used might stimulate greater consumer use of them.

Many meat purchases were tentatively planned before the homemaker arrived at the store. Approximately half the respondents

said they always made a written list before going to shop for groceries. Thirty percent said they never made a written list. An analysis of market lists submitted showed wide variation in depth of advance planning.

Fifty-seven percent of those submitting market lists indicated specific meats by kind and cut. Sixteen percent indicated the meat order using the word "meat." Eleven percent listed "meat" and one cut of meat; 3 percent listed "fish" only; and 13 percent listed no meat on their shopping lists.

The majority of homemakers were aware of and influenced by store advertising of meat. Seventy percent said the stores where they shopped had weekend meat specials. Of these, 42 percent reported they bought one such meat item every week; 23 percent said they bought one every two weeks; and 13 percent said they hardly ever or never bought a featured meat item.

Although 70 percent of the homemakers indicated they did some advanced planning of meat purchases by use of meat advertising information or shopping lists, approximately 30 percent lacked interest or knowledge about planning meat purchases prior to shopping. Only 30 percent of the sample, 57 percent of those making written shopping lists, itemized intended meat purchases by specific kind and cut.

Relating food shopping to current supply and retail merchandising plans would prove advantageous to many shoppers. Information of this type should be provided by workers in marketing information for consumers programs to increase homemakers' knowledge and to contribute to the efficiency of the food distribution system.

4. Homemakers had little knowledge of how supply and demand influence meat merchandising at the retail level. Although 60 percent of the homemakers were aware of retail store competition and its influence on meats being advertised at below usual prices, less than one-third were aware of the relationship of total supply to featured meat cuts. Thirty percent thought meat features were possible because a particular store could get a large quantity of meat. One-fifth of the respondents felt that meat features constituted a merchandising plan to sell an oversupply which the store already had on hand.

5. Homemakers' meat purchases were influenced by their knowledge of selection and preparation.

The respondents indicated that color of the lean, more lean and less fat, and marbling were the important factors influencing their beef purchases. Forty-six percent said they looked at the color of the lean when shopping for beef; 45 percent looked for beef with more lean and less fat. Marbling was listed as a buying guide by 32 percent of the homemakers. The amount of bone, color of fat, and grade were each mentioned by 20 percent of the respondents.

Methods of meat cookery were checked for seven cuts. Approximately 50 percent of the homemakers pan-fried hamburgers and pork chops, braised round steak, and roasted fresh pork roast. Eighty-nine percent cooked turkey in the oven and 80 percent prepared ham in the oven. Approximately half those preparing chuck roast used the roasting method and half used the braising method.

Twenty-six percent of the homemakers said they "baked" turkey, 20 percent "baked" pork chops, 37 percent "pot roasted" chuck, and 48 percent "Swissed" round steak. This indicates that the homemakers were familiar with methods for preparing these cuts, but that 30 to 50 percent, depending upon the cut, did not use the correct terminology in describing the cookery method.

Lack of preparation knowledge was given as one reason why approximately 10 percent of the homemakers did not use organ meats and lamb more often.

Homemakers were asked what temperatures they used for cooking nine meat cuts. A wide variation in temperatures was given in most instances and, depending upon the cut, 10 to 20 percent of the homemakers said they did not know the correct temperature.

More homemakers cooked meats at over 325 degrees than at lower temperatures. A range of 20 to 40 percent of the respondents reported using temperatures over 350 degrees for the nine cuts. Only

42 percent reported using the suggested temperatures of 300-325 degrees for cured ham and turkey, 30 percent for beef chuck, 25 percent for fresh pork roast, and even smaller percentages were reported for the remaining cuts.

These results show that homemakers could not recall meat cookery temperatures without assistance of cookbooks or recipes which they might normally use. The temperature variations given for the various cuts indicated homemakers did not generally relate low temperatures with meat cookery. At least half the sample did not recognize that low temperatures for meat cookery result in greater yield, more uniform doneness, better flavor, and easier carving.

These findings verify a need to upgrade homemakers' knowledge of meat buying and preparation. Beef grades and quality factors for selecting red meats, poultry, and fish should receive more emphasis in educational programs, in store advertising, and at the point of sale. Information concerning methods of meat cookery and suggested temperatures for increasing yield and palatability would increase consumer satisfaction with meat purchases and result in better use of economic resources.

6. The homemakers' reasons for recent meat purchases, opinions about weekly meat orders, and reasons for changing intended meat purchase plans indicate that buying and preparation practices are

complex, and that they are influenced by past experiences, present concepts, and family preferences.

Ninety-one percent of the sample showed concern for family approval and acceptance when they listed "family preference" as the reason for their recent meat purchases. Thirty-five percent stated that price or economy was a reason, and health or nutrition was listed as a reason by 10 percent.

The respondents were asked to read weekly meat orders of four families and make any comments they wished. These comments were categorized as they related to nutrition or meal planning, cost and family preference.

Opinions relating to nutrition or meal planning were described as "good variety," "good balance," "good diet," etc. Forty-one percent selected one meat order for these reasons while 36 percent chose another for the same reasons. Forty-six percent stated that one order contained too much pork.

Forty-five percent of the homemakers identified the most expensive meat order and made comments concerning it. These included statements of "too expensive," "expensive," "large income," etc. Twenty-three percent made comments concerning the least expensive meat order.

Twenty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that one meat order was "not their choice," that "the order was not appealing," that

"they would not buy," or that they "did not like the menu."

Over 60 percent of the homemakers said they had recently changed their plans about an intended meat purchase after arrival in the store. Seventy-seven percent of this group gave quality or factors relating to quality as the main reason for selecting another meat. Fifty percent were influenced to make a change either by the price of the intended purchase or an alternative choice.

Homemakers' interests in pleasing the family and opinions relating to nutrition, meal planning, and quality may be used to better understand their concepts of food selection and preparation. Food information which provides assistance in these areas of interest to homemakers should be readily accepted. Personalizing and relating factual information to the homemaker or the family should gain greater audience for food advertisers, retailers, and educators.

7. The size of the package or piece influenced homemakers' meat buying decisions. Twenty-eight percent indicated that size of the package or piece influenced their decision when buying beef and 20 percent referred to the package price as an influencing factor.

Forty-eight percent of the respondents said the size of the package rated as the main reason they selected one beef roast rather than another in the same display.

Sixty-three percent of the sample stated they had recently changed an intended meat purchase after arrival in the store. Package size,

whether too small or too large, was mentioned by 19 percent of this group and was ranked fifth in importance as a reason for changing purchase plans.

This would indicate that homemakers judge the size of the piece in relation to whether it meets preparation plans and the amount of money they want to spend. Recognizing needs of various size families by retailers would better satisfy customer wishes. Meat preparation suggestions or recipe development should be simple enough so that homemakers are willing to adjust them to their family's size.

8. Trading stamps were given in stores where over half the respondents bought meat. Ninety percent of this group said they would continue to buy most of their meat in the store if trading stamps were discontinued while only 5 percent indicated they would discontinue meat purchases in that store.

9. Multiple sources provide information about meat buying and influence homemakers' buying and preparation practices. In addition to mass media, which will be discussed in the following section, 83 percent of the sample reported using other sources of information within two or three months prior to the survey. Store displays were listed as an influencing factor by 52 percent, friends by 46 percent, labels by 34 percent, and store managers or clerks by 25 percent.

This indicates that improvement in meat purchase and preparation practices might be achieved with educational information at the store level where display, labels, and personnel afford such an opportunity. Meat cookery method, preparation terminology, information on yield, etc., would up-grade present consumer knowledge and contribute to more effective use of livestock, poultry, and fishery products.

Homemakers' Use of Available
Information About Meat Buying

1. A significant number of the homemakers in this sample checked store advertising before buying meat. Sixty-two percent said they always checked meat advertisements in newspapers while 27 percent reported they never did.

Slightly more homemakers over 40 years of age checked this source of information about meat buying than did those in other age groups. A higher percentage of homemakers with elementary school education checked store advertising than did those in other education groups. Homemakers with incomes over \$10,000 used store advertising less frequently than those in other income groups.

Approximately 60 percent of the respondents looked for meat advertising in local newspapers while 72 percent mentioned store circulars as a source of such information.

The number of homemakers checking store advertising of meat and their use of the information, as discussed under factors influencing purchase, attests to its value in meat marketing. These responses indicate that approximately 30 percent of the shoppers did not use this source of information. Younger homemakers may lack shopping experience or may not recognize the value of meat advertising for consumers. Those in higher income groups had greater freedom of selection and correspondingly expressed less interest in such information.

2. Forty-eight percent of the homemakers reported they had read useful information about meat buying in newspapers (other than that carried in ads) within six weeks prior to the survey. Again, 60 percent of these homemakers found this information in their local newspapers.

Generally, a higher percentage of homemakers under 60 years of age, in families with more than two persons, with higher than elementary school education, and with over \$5,400 income read useful information about meat buying in newspapers.

Fifty percent of the respondents under 60 years of age, with over two persons in the family and in most income groups, had read such information, and about one-third of the homemakers over 60 years of age and in families of one or two persons had.

These findings indicate that about half the homemakers looked further than newspaper ads for information about meat buying, and that

such information was available in local papers. Families of over two persons in which the homemaker was under 60 used such information more often than other homemakers. This would suggest that families with children are consciously seeking information to assist with meat purchase and preparation decisions. Those supplying information about meat for newspapers might spend a larger proportion of space and content toward meeting needs of families with children at home.

3. The homemakers in this study used newspapers for information about meat buying more frequently than other media. Forty-eight percent said they had read such useful information in newspapers within the six weeks prior to the survey. Eighteen percent reported seeing useful information about meat buying on television during that period and 14 percent had heard such information on radio.

The homemakers' use of various mass media indicates that those wishing to reach consumers with information about meat buying should emphasize use of newspapers. The responses do not indicate that television and radio are not successful, for the amount of time allowed by stations for such information is limited to commercials and public service time. It is evident that use of the three mass media would result in reaching more consumers than use of one or two.

4. Homemakers securing information about meat through mass media, within six weeks prior to the survey, judged price information most useful. Forty-nine percent of those seeing information about meat

buying on television, 53 percent of those reading such information in newspapers, and 67 percent of those hearing such information on radio listed price information most useful.

Approximately one-third of the respondents ranked supply information second in usefulness. Information on selection and information on preparation or use were each judged useful by about 20 percent of the respondents. Information about grades was deemed useful by about 15 percent of those reading newspapers and seeing television for information about meat buying, and by 30 percent of those hearing such information on radio.

These responses indicate the information homemakers received through various mass media during the six weeks prior to the survey and how they scored its usefulness. Their statements concerning the type of information they would look for if they knew it was in the paper and the kinds of information about meat buying homemakers want were more indicative of the information they judged most useful.¹

5. About half the homemakers receiving information about meat buying through newspapers and radio used it in planning before going to the store. Almost 40 percent of these homemakers used the information as a guide to economy or thrifty choice. Approximately 20 percent reading such information in newspapers, or hearing it on radio, used it as an addition to their knowledge.

¹See pages 98 and 99.

Only 16 percent seeing useful information about meat buying on television reported using it in planning before going to the store or as a guide to economy or thrifty choice. Thirteen percent viewing such information on television used it in preparation or use at home.

These findings reemphasize the facts that many homemakers tentatively plan meat purchases before shopping and that there is interest and awareness concerning price or cost of meat. This interest in cost of meat is again shown in their response to information about meat homemakers want.¹

Those using media to reach homemakers with information about meat buying have an opportunity to assist with ideas for meat selection prior to store shopping. Information on meat pricing methods and cost comparisons should prove of interest and value to homemakers using mass media for shopping information.

Although half the respondents reported using information about meat buying obtained through newspapers, this represented only one-fourth of the sample. Percentages of homemakers finding and using such information through radio and television were much smaller. Those reached were small compared to potential numbers. Educators might devise additional methods to:

interest more homemakers in the value of food information
provided through mass media, and

¹See page 101.

develop other methods to reach homemakers in the community.

Homemakers' Interpretation of
Information About Meat Buying

Homemakers varied in their ability to interpret four paragraphs of news writing providing information on seasonality, grades, cost comparison, and outlook.

When scores that were correct or partly correct were added, the results showed homemakers had a better understanding of cost comparison information than the other types. Seventy-nine percent scored cost comparison information correct or partly correct compared to 76 percent for grade information, 71 percent for seasonal information, and 64 percent for outlook information. Respondents with less than high school education were least accurate in interpreting the news writing.

Less than half the homemakers interpreted the news information about meat the same as the person writing it.¹ Forty-five percent gave correct scores for cost comparison information compared to 38 percent, outlook information; 33 percent, grade information; and 26 percent, seasonal information.

These responses indicate that homemakers' perceptions and interpretations were influenced by their past experience, knowledge, and

¹In an evaluation of selected releases of marketing information for consumers, a thesis by Marcia M. Gillespie (1958), consumers and specialists differed markedly in their evaluation of "useful information."

present concepts. This would imply that those writing for consumers should do so in terms of the experience and interests of the readers. Sentence structure should be clear and concise. Explanation, comparison, etc., should be short and easily understood by readers with less than high school education.

Information About Meat Buying Homemakers Want

1. Homemakers indicated that news releases including information on meat grades, cost comparison, seasonality, and outlook would be useful. Given an opportunity to express opinions relative to usefulness, 37 percent listed grade information first. Cost comparison information was ranked first by 28 percent, seasonal information by 21 percent, and outlook information by 8 percent.

When scores for first and second places were added, cost comparison and grade information were very similar. Only two-thirds as many respondents ranked seasonal information in these places and only one-third as many scored outlook information in these places. Fifty percent placed outlook information in fourth place.

The information on grades was first choice of 31 to 45 percent of the homemakers in various age, education, and income groups. Homemakers with high school education listed information about grades most useful while those with more than high school education ranked information about grades, cost comparison, and seasonality about the same.

Information about cost comparison was ranked most useful by homemakers under 40 years of age. Thirty-two percent of this age group listed it first while approximately 40 percent of the homemakers in other age groups ranked information about grades first.

Information about seasonality was judged most useful to those with the lowest income, 55 percent compared to 39 to 44 percent in other income groups.

These results correlate with others relative to interests of homemakers with children at home. These homemakers were consistently interested in cost or price of meat and in cost comparison. Information on grades and cost comparison relates to immediate needs and may have appeared more useful to these homemakers. Information on supply and seasonality relates to the future food situation and did not rank as useful. These responses may also imply that the respondents were more familiar with grade and cost comparison information and this may have weighted their choice of useful information.

This does not imply that information which homemakers voted less useful should be removed from consumer programs. Information about seasonality and outlook will improve knowledge of the food marketing system and assist homemakers to make more intelligent buying decisions over time.

2. After ranking the usefulness of news information about meat buying, homemakers were asked which releases they would look for if

they knew they were in the paper. Thirty-one percent scored information about grades in first place compared to 25 percent for cost comparison information, 24 percent for seasonal information, and 12 percent for outlook information.

Sixty-one percent of the respondents ranked grade information in first and second places while 58 percent ranked cost comparison in these places. Forty-one percent ranked seasonal information in the top two places and only 29 percent scored outlook information in these places.

A higher percentage of homemakers under 40 years of age were interested in these types of food information. Those over 60 years of age showed less interest in outlook information than homemakers in other age groups.

A higher percentage of homemakers with less than high school education said they would look for information on cost comparison and grades than homemakers with higher education. A higher percentage of homemakers with more than high school education said they would look for information about seasonality and outlook than those in other groups. Homemakers with less than high school education indicated least interest in information on seasonality and outlook.

Generally, a larger percentage of homemakers in each income group said they would look for information on cost comparison and grades than for information on seasonality or outlook. Information on

cost comparison was scored in first or second place by a larger percentage of homemakers in the \$4,000 to \$10,000 income range than other types of information. Homemakers with under \$2,000 indicated more interest in information about seasonality than did homemakers in other groups.

Eleven percent of the respondents indicated they would never read information on grades compared to 14 percent for cost comparison information, 15 percent for seasonal information, and 18 percent for outlook information.

The response to this question verifies the homemakers' previously stated opinions concerning useful information about meat buying. The four types of information about meat were in the same rank order as previously.

The implications are the same as for the preceding findings. The economic and social needs of families in which the homemaker is under 40 years of age and children are at home differ from other families.¹ (Half these homemakers were under 40 years of age and 89 percent had children at home).

3. When asked to express opinions as to kinds of information about meat buying which other homemakers want, the respondents

¹Elizabeth E. Hoyt et al., American Income and Its Use (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 115. The peak of family income tends to come when the head of the family is around 50. Stages in the family income cycle are accompanied by important changes in the size and composition of families. To some extent increased need is matched by increased income.

listed meat cookery, meat costs, and guides for selection as primary concerns. Given 12 statements relative to meat, they were asked to select and rank six they thought other homemakers would like to know more about.

Sixty-six percent indicated that homemakers were interested in how to cook different meat cuts. How to spend less money for meat was selected by 61 percent of the homemakers and comparing costs between different meat cuts by 57 percent. Learning to recognize different meat cuts, how to choose various kinds of meat, meat grades, proper care of meat in the refrigerator and freezer, and information on meat supplies for the week were each judged important by approximately 50 percent of the sample.

This study indicates that homemakers want or recognize a need for various kinds of information about meat buying. They want information to assist with plans prior to shopping, in-store selection, and care and use of the product at home.

The expressed desire for information on how to cook meat implies that homemakers are looking for additional methods and recipes to satisfy family needs. Recognition of the cost of meat in relation to other food products may be one reason the respondents were interested in ways to extend meat dollars. Their expressed wishes for information on selection of different meat cuts and grades implies a need for greater knowledge in these areas. The desire for information

about weekly meat supplies implies that homemakers want assistance with current buying decisions which they may use to their advantage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agricultural Marketing Service. A Review of 1955 Survey Data on Household Meat Consumption. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1957.
2. Agricultural Marketing Service. Consumption Patterns for Meat. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1958.
3. Agricultural Marketing Service. Income and Household Size . . . Their Effects on Food Consumption. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1959.
4. Agricultural Marketing Service. Meat Consumption Trends and Patterns. Washington: United State Department of Agriculture, 1960.
5. Agricultural Marketing Service. Urban and Farm Use of Meat. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1958.
6. Bland, Frankye E. and Mize, Jessie J. Consumer Motivation and Use of Poultry. Contribution to Southern Regional Research Project SM-13. Athens, Georgia: College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, 1960.
7. Borton, R. E. "Consumer Use of Mass Media for Food Information." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1957.
8. Boyts, M. D. "An Evaluation of Marketing Information for Restaurants, Hospitals and Schools." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1957.
9. Burk, Marguerite C. "Significance of Current Developments in Food Statistics." Paper read before the American Marketing Association, June 18, 1959, Cleveland, Ohio.
10. Bresser, Walter and Sons. Bresser's Cross-Index Directory for South Oakland County. Detroit: Walter Bresser & Sons, 1960.

11. Cooley, Esther; Powe, Dorothy D. ; Matthews, J. L. ; and Ueland, Gale. Informing Consumers in Lake Charles. Evaluation of the Marketing Information Program for Consumers. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Division of Agricultural Extension, Louisiana State University, 1958.
12. Du Pont De Nemours and Co. Today's Buying Decisions. Sixth Consumer Buying Habits Study. Wilmington, Delaware: Du Pont De Nemours and Co. (Inc.), 1959.
13. Economic Research Service. Demand and Prices for Meat, Factors Influencing Their Historical Development. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1961.
14. Fessenden, Jewell G. and Spindler, Evelyn B. Problems in Feeding the Family. A report of a nationwide study of homemakers enrolled in home demonstration organizations. Washington: Federal Extension Service, 1957.
15. Gartner, Joseph and Kolmer, Lee. Economic Information for Consumer Marketing Programs, Consumer Marketing Bulletin II. Ames, Iowa: Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University, 1961.
16. Gillespie, Marcia M. "Consumer Evaluation of Food Marketing Information." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1958.
17. Holmes, Mary S. "Some Indications of Homemakers' Knowledge About Food Buying and Attitudes Toward Food Buying Information." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 1959.
18. Hoobler, S. Q. Homemakers' Values, Motivations, and Knowledge in Food Buying. Summary of an exploratory study with some implications for Extension Consumer Marketing Programs. Washington, D. C. : Federal Extension Service, 1959.
19. Hoyt, Elizabeth E.; Reid, Margaret G. ; McConnell, Joseph L. ; Hooks, Janet M. ; and Muelder, Walter G. American Income and Its Use. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

20. Mize, Jessie J. and Stringer, William C. Choosing Beef for Household Use. Contribution to Southern Regional Research Project SM-19. Athens, Georgia: College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, 1959.
21. Perdue, E. J.; Franzmann, J. R.; Judge, G. G.; and Walters, L. E. Some Results from a Pilot Investigation of Consumer Preferences for Beef. Processed Series P-304. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University, 1958.
22. Porter, Ward F.,; Armentrout, W. W.; Conrad, Mary K.; Dimit, Robert; Lyon, Gale; Swank, Chester E.; and Ueland, Gale. Food Buying--Knowledge--Concerns--Practices. An evaluation of the Marketing Information for Consumers Program in the Wheeling-Steubenville Area. Morgantown, West Virginia: College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, West Virginia University, 1961.
23. Rhodes, V. James; Kiehl, Elmer R.; and Brady, D. E. Visual Preferences for Grades of Retail Beef Cuts. Columbia, Missouri: College of Agriculture, University of Missouri, 1955.
24. Shaffer, James D. Frequency of Purchase of Particular Items of Meat, Poultry and Fish. A Consumer Panel Report. East Lansing, Michigan: Agricultural Economics Department, Michigan State University, 1958.
25. U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1960. Vol. I.
26. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Household Food Consumption Survey: 1955. Food Consumption of Households in the North Central Region. Report No. 1 and 3.
27. Van de Mark, Mildred S. and Mize, Jessie J. Meat Choices for Family Meals in Selected Cities Alabama-Georgia. Contribution to Southern Regional Research Project SM-13. Auburn, Alabama: Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University, 1961.
28. Zehner, Mary D. "An Exploratory Study of Consumer Food Buying Decisions, Lansing, Michigan." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Michigan State University, 1961.

APPENDIX A

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Appendix Table 1. Family Meat Expenditure of Previous Week, Related to Education

Expenditure	Education group			Total sample
	Less than 9 grades	9-12 grades	More than 12 grades	
	Percent			Percent
Under \$15.00	88	85	88	87
\$15.00 - \$30.00	12	15	12	13
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
<hr/>				
Number of respondents	26	169	109	304

Total Respondents = 304

Appendix Table 2. Homemakers Reading Useful Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads, Related to Education

Reading useful information	Education group			Total sample Percent
	Less than 9 grades	9-12 grades	More than 12 grades	
	Percent			
Yes	38	50	50	48
No	58	46	45	44
No answer	4	4	5	8
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of respondents	26	169	109	304

Total respondents = 304

Appendix Table 3. Rank Given Useful Information About Meat Buying Read in Newspapers, Other than in Ads

Useful information	Rank			Total scores	*Percent of total responses
	1st	2nd	3rd		
Price	34	18	1	78	53
Supply	13	16	7	53	36
Selection	9	7	7	34	23
Grade	5	4	13	32	22
Preparation or Use	9	3	3	22	15
Cuts	2	5	4	16	11

**Number of respondents 148

Total respondents 304

*Percentages add to more than 100 because more than one kind of useful information was sometimes given.

**148 respondents indicated they had read such information within six weeks prior to the survey.

Appendix Table 4. Homemakers' Use of Information About Meat Buying in Newspapers, Other than in Ads

Use of information	Rank			Total scores	*Percent of total responses
	1st	2nd	3rd		
In planning before going to the store	68	7	2	77	52
As a guide to economy or thrifty choice	23	26	9	58	39
In selection at the store	14	18	1	33	22
Just added to homemaker's knowledge	16	6	4	26	19
In preparation or use at home	7	9	7	23	16
In care at home	2	2	4	8	5
Other ways	3	1	0	4	3

**Number of respondents 148

Total respondents = 304

*Percentages add to more than 100 because more than one use was sometimes given.

**148 respondents indicated they had read such information within six weeks prior to the survey.

Appendix Table 5. Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying, Related to Age

Age	Interpretation	Type of information			
		Seasonal	Grade	Cost comparison	Outlook
		Percent			
Under 40	Correct	28	38	47	37
	Partly correct	48	39	36	25
	Incorrect	21	20	13	33
	No answers	3	3	4	5
	Total	100	100	100	100
40-60	Correct	24	28	44	39
	Partly correct	43	50	34	28
	Incorrect	29	14	16	25
	No answers	4	8	6	8
	Total	100	100	100	100
Over 60	Correct	25	31	39	36
	Partly correct	42	36	22	20
	Incorrect	25	22	28	33
	No answers	8	11	1	11
	Total	100	100	100	100

Total respondents = 304

Appendix Table 6. Homemakers' Interpretation of News Information About Meat Buying, Related to Education

Education	Interpretation	Type of information			
		Seasonal	Grade	Cost comparison	Outlook
		Percent			
Less than 9 grades	Correct	16	19	15	19
	Partly correct	42	38	46	19
	Incorrect	42	38	35	58
	No answers	0	5	4	4
	Total	100	100	100	100
9-12 grades	Correct	28	32	42	34
	Partly correct	43	44	36	27
	Incorrect	24	17	15	30
	No answers	5	7	7	9
	Total	100	100	100	100
More than 12 grades	Correct	26	38	54	43
	Partly correct	48	42	28	27
	Incorrect	22	16	14	26
	No answers	4	4	4	4
	Total	100	100	100	100

Total respondents = 304

Appendix Table 7. News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful, Related to Age

Type of information	Rank	Age group		
		Under 40	40-60	Over 60
		Percent		
Seasonal	1st	25	16	25
	2nd	23	17	19
	3rd	29	38	39
	4th	14	19	17
	No answers	9	10	0
	Total	100	100	100
Grade	1st	27	42	44
	2nd	23	20	28
	3rd	21	18	20
	4th	20	10	3
	No answers	9	10	5
	Total	100	100	100
Cost comparison	1st	32	24	31
	2nd	32	41	28
	3rd	21	15	22
	4th	5	10	19
	No answers	10	10	0
	Total	100	100	100
Outlook	1st	9	10	0
	2nd	15	10	25
	3rd	18	20	19
	4th	48	50	36
	No answers	10	10	0
	Total	100	100	100
Number of respondents		150	118	36

Total respondents = 304

Appendix Table 8. News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful, Related to Education

Type of information	Rank	Education group		
		Less than 9 grades	9-12 grades	More than 12 grades
		Percent		
Seasonal	1st	15	19	28
	2nd	12	23	16
	3rd	46	32	34
	4th	15	17	14
	No answers	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Grade	1st	38	43	28
	2nd	27	24	22
	3rd	19	16	24
	4th	8	11	21
	No answers	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Cost comparison	1st	42	24	29
	2nd	38	33	40
	3rd	4	24	14
	4th	4	9	11
	No answers	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Outlook	1st	0	6	12
	2nd	15	12	17
	3rd	15	19	18
	4th	58	52	45
	No answers	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Number of respondents		26	169	109

Total Respondents = 304

Appendix Table 9. News Information About Meat Buying Which Homemakers Think Most Useful, Related to Income

Type of information	Rank	Income group					
		Under \$2, 000	\$2, 001- \$4, 000	\$4, 001- \$5, 400	\$5, 401- \$7, 000	\$7, 001- \$10, 000	Over \$10, 000
		Percent					
Seasonal	1st	37	25	24	25	19	9
	2nd	18	19	18	14	22	32
	3rd	9	44	34	34	33	40
	4th	9	12	12	21	15	13
	No answer	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Grade	1st	27	37	31	34	34	45
	2nd	37	44	18	27	19	23
	3rd	9	19	24	20	21	14
	4th	0	0	18	17	16	11
	No answer	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cost comparison	1st	9	38	27	29	26	32
	2nd	9	37	46	41	35	27
	3rd	37	25	15	19	13	21
	4th	18	0	0	7	16	11
	No answer	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Outlook	1st	0	0	9	8	12	7
	2nd	18	0	45	17	15	11
	3rd	9	12	9	22	19	18
	4th	46	88	28	47	44	55
	No answer	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
*Number of respondents		11	16	33	103	85	44

Total respondents = 304

*4 percent of sample did not give income.

Appendix Table 10. Information Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper, Related to Age

Type of information	Rank	Age group		
		Under 40	40-60	Over 60
		Percent		
Seasonal	1st	23	23	28
	2nd	20	16	6
	3rd	29	31	36
	4th	13	15	8
	Would not read	15	15	22
	Total	100	100	100
Grade	1st	21	31	19
	2nd	25	21	45
	3rd	21	21	11
	4th	23	17	6
	Would not read	10	10	19
	Total	100	100	100
Cost comparison	1st	34	29	31
	2nd	25	31	17
	3rd	23	15	19
	4th	6	10	11
	Would not read	12	15	22
	Total	100	100	100
Outlook	1st	16	9	3
	2nd	20	17	11
	3rd	10	17	11
	4th	39	38	53
	Would not read	15	19	22
	Total	100	100	100
Number of respondents		150	118	36

Total respondents = 304

Appendix Table 11. Information Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper, Related to Education

Type of information	Rank	Education group		
		Less than 9 grades	9-12 grades	More than 12 grades
		Percent		
Seasonal	1st	11	23	27
	2nd	4	16	20
	3rd	50	30	27
	4th	11	15	11
	Would not read	<u>24</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>15</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Grade	1st	35	29	16
	2nd	35	24	26
	3rd	11	19	21
	4th	4	15	26
	Would not read	<u>15</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Cost comparison	1st	35	32	31
	2nd	38	25	25
	3rd	8	19	24
	4th	4	9	7
	Would not read	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>13</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Outlook	1st	4	10	18
	2nd	8	17	19
	3rd	8	15	11
	4th	58	41	38
	Would not read	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>14</u>
	Total	100	100	100
Number of respondents		26	169	109

Total respondents = 304

Appendix Table 12. Information Homemakers Would Look for if They Knew It Was in the Newspaper, Related to Income

Type of information	Rank	Income group					
		Under \$2,000	\$2,001-\$4,000	\$4,001-\$5,400	\$5,401-\$7,000	\$7,001-\$10,000	Over \$10,000
		Percent					
Seasonal	1st	37	25	21	24	24	19
	2nd	27	19	18	13	21	16
	3rd	9	31	37	33	26	30
	4th	0	19	15	18	11	12
	Would not read	<u>27</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>23</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Grade	1st	18	38	24	26	20	18
	2nd	37	43	21	28	17	31
	3rd	18	19	25	20	28	9
	4th	0	0	18	21	22	21
	Would not read	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>21</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cost comparison	1st	9	31	40	33	26	36
	2nd	0	38	27	31	33	7
	3rd	46	25	15	18	18	29
	4th	18	6	6	8	11	7
	Would not read	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>21</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Outlook	1st	0	6	6	13	17	9
	2nd	9	0	24	20	15	25
	3rd	9	19	12	14	14	7
	4th	55	69	49	39	37	36
	Would not read	<u>27</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>23</u>
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
*Number of respondents		11	16	33	103	85	44

Total respondents = 304

*4 percent of sample did not give income.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

CONFIDENTIAL

Michigan State University

Marketing Information for Consumers Program

Call Number	Respondent	Date	Time	Time likely to be home	Remarks
First	Original				
Second	Original				
	First alternate				
Third	Original				
	First alternate				
	Second alternate				
Fourth	Original				
	First alternate				
	Second alternate				

Respondent	Name	Street Address	Apt. No.	Telephone
Original				
First alternate				
Second alternate				

Interviewer's name _____

Interview number _____

First, let's check to see where you get information about meat buying.

1. Within the past 6 weeks, how often have you checked store advertising in newspapers before buying meat?

always	1
more than half the time	2
half the time	3
less than half the time	4
never	5

If never, skip to question 4

2. If you have checked meat advertising within the last 6 weeks, in which papers did you find it?

Royal Oak Tribune	1
Detroit Free Press	2
Detroit News	3
Detroit Times	4
Any other newspapers	5
Store circular	6

3. If you check meat ads in papers which days do you look for the ads?

Monday	1
Tuesday	2
Wednesday	3
Thursday	4
Friday	5
Saturday	6
Sunday	7
no special day	8

4. Do you look for information about meat buying other than what you find in the ads?

yes	1
no	2
yes, but never find	3
other comments	4

If yes in 4, ask:

5. How often do you look?

Would you say that you look

every week	1
about twice a month	2
about once a month	3
less than once a month	4
never	5

If the answer to 5 is yes, ask:

6. In which papers do you find information about meat buying other than advertising?

Royal Oak Tribune	1
Detroit Free Press	2
Detroit News	3
Detroit Times	4
Any Others	5

7. Within the last 6 weeks, have you read any useful information about meat buying in papers other than that carried in the ads?

yes	1
no	2

If answer to 7 is yes, ask:

8. What information?

Price	1
Supply	2
Grade	3
Selection	4
Preparation or use	5
Cuts	6
Other _____	7

If more than one thing mentioned
in 8, ask:

9. What was most useful?

	<u>order ranked</u>
Price	_____
Supply	_____
Grade	_____
Selection	_____
Preparation or use	_____
Cuts	_____
Other _____	_____

If answer to 7 is yes, ask:

10. How did you use this information about meat buying?

	<u>order listed</u>		
In planning before going to store	1 _____	Just add to homemaker's present knowledge	6 _____
In selection at the store	2 _____	Other:	7 _____
In care at home	3 _____	_____	
In preparation or use at home	4 _____	_____	
As a guide to economy or thrifty choice	5 _____	_____	

11. Do you have a radio in working order?

yes 1
no 2

12. Do you get any information about meat buying on radio?

yes 1
no 2

If answer to 12 is yes, ask:

13. Which programs give you this kind of information?

	Station _____	Program _____	Spots _____	Day of week _____	Proper Identification	
					Yes	No
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

14. Within the last 6 weeks, have you heard any information about meat buying on radio?

yes 1
no 2

If answer to 12 is yes, ask:

15. Can you tell me what information about meat buying you heard on radio?

Price 1
Supply 2
Grade 3
Selection 4
Preparation or use 5
Cuts 6
Others _____ 7

If more than one thing mentioned in 8, ask:

16. What was most useful?

order ranked

Price _____
 Supply _____
 Grade _____
 Selection _____
 Preparation or use _____
 Cuts _____
 Others _____

19. Do you get any information about meat buying on television?

yes 1
 no 2

If answer to 14 is yes, ask:

17. How did you use the information about meat buying which you heard on radio?

Order listed

In planning before to store 1 _____
 In selection at the store 2 _____
 In care at home 3 _____
 In preparation or use at home 4 _____
 As a guide to economy or thrifty choice 5 _____
 Just added to home-maker's present knowledge 6 _____
 Other: 7 _____

18. Do you have a television set in working order?

yes 1
 no 2

If answer to 19 is yes, ask:

20. Which programs give you this kind of information?

	<u>Station</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Day of Week</u>	<u>Proper Identification</u>	
				Yes	No
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

21. Within the last 6 weeks, have you seen any information about meat buying on television?

yes 1
no 2

If more than one thing mentioned in 22, ask:

23. What was most useful?

If answer to 21 is yes, ask:

22. Can you tell me what information about meat buying you saw on television?

Price 1
Supply 2
Grade 3
Selection 4
Preparation or use 5
Cuts 6
Other _____ 7

Price _____
Supply _____
Grade _____
Selection _____
Preparation or use _____
Cuts _____
Other _____

Order ranked

If answer to 21 is yes, ask:

24. How did you use the information about meat buying you saw on television?

	<u>Order listed</u>	
In planning before		
going to store	1	_____
In selection at the store	2	_____
In care at home	3	_____
In preparation or use		
at home	4	_____
As a guide to economy		
or thrifty choice	5	_____
Just added to home-		
maker's present		
knowledge	6	_____
Other:	7	_____

25. There are other ways besides newspapers, radio and television that homemakers get information about meat buying. Would you look at this list and tell me which of these you have gotten information about meat buying from within the last 2 or 3 months.

	<u>order listed</u>	
neighbors and friends	1	_____
manager or clerks in		
store	2	_____
labels on meat	3	_____
store displays of meat	4	_____
magazines	5	_____
Other _____	6	_____

Next, I, d like to talk with you about the meat you buy. This will include beef, pork, veal, lamb, poultry, the fish and seafood you buy.

26. On which day did you buy most of your meat last week or the last time you bought meat?

Monday	1
Tuesday	2
Wednesday	3
Thursday	4
Friday	5
Saturday	6
Sunday	7
No special day	8

27. Who did the meat shopping last week or the last time you bought meat?

Wife alone	1
Husband alone	2
Wife and husband together	3
Daughter	4
Son	5
Other adult, male, unmarried or widower	6
Other adult, female, unmarried or widow	7

28. In what kind of store did you buy most of your meat last time?

small neighborhood grocery store	1
neighborhood meat market	2
large food store in shopping center	3
large food store, not in a shopping center	4
other store _____	5

29. What are your reasons for buying meat where you do rather than at other places?

	Order listed
convenience	1 _____
quality	2 _____
easy to select	3 _____
price or economy	4 _____
freshness	5 _____
store personnel	6 _____
no special reason	7 _____
variety or selection	8 _____
store guarantee or confidence in store	9 _____
flavor	10 _____
other reasons _____	11 _____

30. Does the store where you bought the most meat last month give trading stamps?

yes	1
no	2

If the answer to 30 is yes, ask:

31. Do you always take the stamps?

yes	1
no	2

If answer to 30 is yes, ask:

32. If trading stamps were discontinued, would you continue to buy most of the meat in this store?

yes	1
no	2
don't know	3

33. Does the store where you buy the most meat have meat "specials" the last part of the week?

yes	1
no	2

If the answer to 33 is yes, ask:

34. How often do you buy one of the meats on "special"?

every week	1
about once every 2 weeks	2
every 3 weeks	3
once a month	4
hardly ever	5
never	6

35. Does the store where you buy the most meat have meat "specials" on Mondays and Tuesdays?

yes	1
no	2
don't know	3

36. Why do you think stores feature certain meat cuts as "specials"?

	<u>Order listed</u>		
because store could get a large quantity	1 _____		
don't know	2 _____		
because store bought at a low wholesale price	3 _____		
because meat supplies are plentiful and price is low	4 _____	to sell an over supply which the store has on hand	7 _____
because the quality is inferior	5 _____	Other reason _____	8 _____
to bring more customers in the store	6 _____	_____	

37. In the past year, how often would you say you made a written list before going to shop for groceries?

never	1
less than half the time	2
half the time	3
more than half the time	4
always	5

38. Do you have a shopping list that I might have? Perhaps the one you used last week or the one for this week? If you don't have one on hand would you take this paper and write a shopping list as you usually do. Just list the things you plan to buy when you do this week's food shopping.

39. What meats did you buy when you did last week's food shopping?

_____	1
_____	2
_____	3
_____	4
_____	5
_____	6
_____	7

40. What cuts of meat have you bought most often within the last 2 months?

_____	1
_____	2
_____	3
_____	4
_____	5

41. What are your main reasons for buying these?

Order listed

family preference	1
price or economy	2
easy to prepare	3
quick to prepare	4
other reasons	5

42. What meat dishes do you most often prepare for your family ?

1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5	_____

43. Are there any cuts or kinds of meat which you believe some women you know do not buy because they do not know how to properly prepare them?

yes	1
no	2

If answer to 43 is yes, ask:

44. What?

Cuts

Kinds

1	_____	1	_____
2	_____	2	_____
3	_____	3	_____
4	_____	4	_____

45. Are there cuts or kinds of meat you avoid because you are not sure about how to prepare them?

yes 1
no 2

If yes to 45, ask:

46. What?

<u>Cuts</u>	<u>Kinds</u>
1 _____	1 _____
2 _____	2 _____
3 _____	3 _____
4 _____	4 _____

47. Tell me how you most often cook the following meats.

1 round steak	_____
2 chuck roast	_____
3 pork chops	_____
4 fresh pork	_____
roast	_____
5 cured ham	_____
6 fryer	_____
7 fish	_____
8 hamburger	_____
9 turkey	_____

48. Tell me the approximate temperature you use when cooking these meats.

Temperature

1 round steak	_____
2 chuck roast	_____
3 pork chops	_____
4 fresh pork roast	_____
5 cured ham	_____
6 fryer	_____
7 fish	_____
8 hamburger	_____
9 turkey	_____

49. How often would you say that you buy?

	More than once a month	Months				Never
		1	2-3	3-6	6-12	
1 liver						
2 picnic ham						
3 pork shoulder roast						
4 lamb shoulder roast						
5 fish						
6 frying chicken						
7 hamburger						

50. What are your main reasons for not buying liver more often?

Order listed

dislike flavor 1 _____
 don't know how to 2 _____
 prepare 3 _____
 other reasons _____

51. What are your main reasons for not buying picnic (ham) more often?

Order listed

dislike flavor 1 _____
 too much waste 2 _____
 difficult to carve 3 _____
 don't know how to 4 _____
 prepare 5 _____
 too salty 6 _____
 too much fat 7 _____
 other reasons _____

52. What are your main reasons for not buying pork shoulder roast more often?

Order listed

dislike flavor 1 _____
 too much waste 2 _____
 difficult to carve 3 _____
 don't know how to 4 _____
 prepare 5 _____
 other reasons _____

53. What are your main reasons for not buying lamb shoulder roast more often?

	<u>Order listed</u>
dislike flavor	1 _____
too much waste	2 _____
difficult to carve	3 _____
don't know how to prepare	4 _____
price	5 _____
other reasons _____	6 _____

54. What are your reasons for not buying fish more often?

	<u>Order listed</u>
dislike flavor	1 _____
too much waste	2 _____
difficult to carve or serve	3 _____
don't know how to prepare	4 _____
don't like to cook it	5 _____
family doesn't like fish	6 _____
would get tired of it if served more often	7 _____
other reasons _____	8 _____

55. What are your reasons for not buying frying chicken more often?

	<u>Order listed</u>
dislike flavor	1 _____
too much waste	2 _____
difficult to carve	3 _____
don't know how to prepare	4 _____
Other reasons _____	5 _____

56. What are your reasons for not buying hamburger more often?

	<u>Order listed</u>
dislike flavor	1 _____
family would tire of it	2 _____
want variety of cuts	3 _____
need more ways to prepare it	4 _____
other reasons _____	5 _____

57. Are there some meats you have not bought within the last year?

yes	1
no	2

If yes to 57, ask:

58. What are they?

1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5	_____

If 58 answered, ask:

59. What are your reasons for not buying?

- 1 _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____
- 4 _____
- 5 _____

60. Sometimes shoppers buy meat other than that they first planned to buy. Sometimes they change their mind even after they are in the store. If you have done this recently, what meat did you first plan to buy?

61. What meat did you buy instead?

62. What were your reasons for changing your mind?

	<u>Order listed</u>
quality did not meet expectations	1 _____
price lower on some cut	2 _____
quality of another cut looked better	3 _____
appearance did not meet expectations	4 _____
size of package did not fit intended purpose	5 _____
appearance better on some other cut	6 _____
sold out of cut shopper expected to buy	7 _____
price higher than expected	8 _____
display caused a change of mind	9 _____
another cut on "special" chosen instead	10 _____
other reasons _____	11 _____

63. What do you look for when buying beef?

	<u>Order listed</u>
Size of package or piece	1 _____
Price of package or piece	2 _____
Grade	3 _____
Color of the lean	4 _____
Color of the fat	5 _____
Thickness or plumpness	6 _____
Texture	7 _____
Label	8 _____
More lean, less fat	9 _____
Amount of bone	10 _____
Color of the bone	11 _____
Marbling	12 _____
Firmness	13 _____
Brand	14 _____
Other	15 _____

64. What grade or grades of beef steak do you find in the store where you buy most of your meat?

Store	Grades
_____	Prime 1
_____	Choice 2
_____	Good 3
_____	Standard 4
_____	Don't know 5
_____	Other 6

65. Why do you choose one beef roast rather than another of the same kind and cut beside it?

	<u>Order listed</u>
Size of the package or piece	1 _____
Price of the package or piece	2 _____
Grade	3 _____
Color of the lean	4 _____
Color of the fat	5 _____
Thickness or plumpness	6 _____
Texture	7 _____
Label	8 _____
More lean, less fat	9 _____
Less bone	10 _____
Marbling	11 _____
Firmness	12 _____
Brand	13 _____
Other	14 _____

66. Are there any particular brands of meat that you have bought within the last 6 weeks?

yes	1
no	2

If answer to 66 is yes, ask:

67. What brands and what kinds of meat?

Brand	Meat
1 _____	_____
2 _____	_____
3 _____	_____
4 _____	_____

If answer to 66 is yes, ask:

68. Is there any special reason why you chose these brands?

Brand 1 _____

Brand 2 _____

Brand 3 _____

Brand 4 _____

69. What suggestions for improvement would you make concerning prepackaged meat?

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

70. How much money do you spend for food each week? Include all the meats, fruits and vegetables, breads and cereals, milk and other dairy foods, sweets, fats and oils that are bought at the store or delivered to your home. Look at this chart and tell me the group that best fits what your family spends for food

under \$15.00	1
\$15.00 - 30.00	2
over 30.00	3

71. In addition to food, how much would you say you spend at the grocery store each week for non-food items such as soaps, paper products, drugs, cosmetics, magazines, alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, etc.

Non-food items (weekly estimate) _____

72. How much money did you spend for meat last week?

73. Was this the usual amount?

more than usual	1	_____
less than usual	2	_____
about as usual	3	_____

74. The meat cuts on these cards were bought by four different families during one week. Would you study these and make any comments you wish about each family.

Family A

Family B

Family C

Family D

Next, I have four samples of information about meat buying which you might find in a newspaper. Would you read these one at a time and answer questions about them.

Seasonal

75. What does this information mean to you?

Correct interpretation 1 _____
Incorrect interpretation 2 _____
Partly correct 3 _____

Grades

76. What does this information mean to you?

Correct interpretation 1 _____
Incorrect interpretation 2 _____
Partly correct 3 _____

Cost Comparison

77. What does this information mean to you?

Correct interpretation	1	_____
Incorrect interpretation	2	_____
Partly correct	3	_____

Outlook Information

78. What does this information mean to you?

Correct interpretation	1	_____
Incorrect interpretation	2	_____
Partly correct	3	_____

79. Now, would you rank the four kinds or types of information in the order in which you find them most useful?

	Rank given
Seasonal	_____
Grades	_____
Cost comparison	_____
Outlook information	_____

80. Which of these types or kinds of information releases would you look for if you knew they were in the paper?

	Order Listed
Seasonal	_____
Grades	_____
Cost comparison	_____
Outlook information	_____

I would now like some information about your family. No names will be taken and all information will be confidential. It will be necessary for me to group families according to age, education, income and so forth.

81. Approximately how many meals are eaten away from home each week? We would like to know which members of the family eat away from home and which meals they eat away from home.

	Brk.	Noon	Night
Husband			
Wife			
Others			
Total			

82. Altogether, how many people are in your household including persons who may board here?

number _____

83. Household Composition

	Household members relationship to household head (wife, son, ward, boarders, etc.)	Sex	Age last birth-day
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

84. Household type:

husband and wife	1
other female head	2
other male head	3

85. In what kind of industry or business is the head of household employed?

86. What is his (or her) occupation?

retired	1	_____
factory worker	2	_____
construction or laborer, non-factory	3	_____
high level salesman or business manager	4	_____
professional	5	_____
other white collar worker	6	_____
other blue collar worker	7	_____

87. Are you employed outside the home?

yes	1
no	2

If answer to 87 is yes, ask:

88. What is your occupation?

If answer to 87 is yes, ask:

89. Do you work full time	1
Do you work half time	2
Do you work less than half time	3

90. What was the highest grade you completed in school or college?

Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

High School 9 10 11 12

Business School 1 2

College 1 2 3 4

91. Would you study this card and tell me which income group you think best fits your family. Include the earnings of all members of the family during the last year and income from all sources after federal income taxes.

This card lists other kinds of income besides wages. Be sure to include all income in your estimate.

\$ 2000 or under	1
2001--4000	2
4001--5400	3
5401--7000	4
7001-10,000	5
over \$ 10,000	6

92. One purpose of this survey is to find what information homemakers would like to know about meat. Look at these cards and choose six which you feel homemakers would like to know more about. Rank these and read the card numbers to me.

Rank	Card Number
1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5	_____
6	_____

93. Interviewer will check: Race:

white 1 _____

non-white 2 _____

ROOM USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED

~~DEC 2 1965~~

~~JUL 1 1966~~

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03085 7019