Research Article

A Study on Consumption Pattern of Meat In and Around Rural Locality of Gannavaram (Andhra Pradesh)

B. Eswara Rao, K. Bhaskar*, E.Naga Mallika, Z. Naveen and R.S.D. Gupta

Department of Livestock Products Technology, NTR College of Veterinary Science, Sri Venkateswara Veterinary University, Gannavaram, Andhra Pradesh

Abstract
In order to ascertain the consumption pattern of meat and meat products in and around gannavaram of Andhra Pradesh a survey has been conducted with a sample size of 60 households. The result revealed most of the households belonged to Agricultural background (63.33%). Most of them belonged to middle age group of 30-50 years (46.66%) They had a family size of more than 5 members (73.33%). The income levels were of medium category (66.66%) with education of primary level, from the study it was noted that half of the respondents like to purchase more than 1200 g of meat per month. The results of the study concluded that most of the respondents are consuming chicken when compared to mutton, chevon and beef. 55% respondents were like to consume meat once a week, the Preference of Season as it was more during winter followed by rainy season and summer.

Majority of the respondents (83.33%) preferred to consume on Sunday followed by Saturday (10.00%), Friday (05.00%) When it comes to place of purchase and consumption of meat almost cent percent people likely to purchase meat from retail shops. But when it comes to consumption, (86.66%) of respondents preferred to consume meat at home.

Keywords: Rural locality, consumer, consumption pattern, meat

*Correspondence
Author: K.Bhaskar
Email: bhaskarvet9989@gmail.com

Introduction

Meat consumption is increasing in India as it is being attached with the quality of life. With globalization and improving life style, consumer concerns about food are changing rapidly. The consumption pattern of food of animal origin has also changed a lot with purchasing power and availability of various products. During seventies, price of commodity was the main criteria but now many other factors are playing role during purchase viz., income, age, sex, ethnicity, convenience and price have significant impact on food items demanded by consumers.[1] reviewed socio-demographic dimensions of changes and differences in meat consumption. Gender has a strong influence on attitudes towards meat and meat consumption. Men generally consume more meat than women and that women are more concerned about a healthy diet and about food choices in general. Old aged persons prefer to butchers shops whereas young generation is going to the supermarkets. A negative determinant of meat consumption can be seen in the age of consumers. In contrast to the traditional view of meat as being tasty, a dislike of the taste of meat is seen as factors leading to a reduction or avoidance of meat. Consumption behavior of these foods, especially meat and its products is a deciding factor in the development of livestock sector in general and a specific enterprise in particular [2].

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in Gannavaram using exploratory research design. Sixty households in and around gannavaram of Andhra Pradesh were selected randomly to collect information on consumption pattern and their preference towards Meat and meat products. Using pretested structured interview schedule, the respondents were personally interviewed and the data were collected. The data was subjected to statistical analysis [3]. Least significant differences were calculated at appropriate level of significance following analysis of variance. The data were presented in tables expressed by frequency and percentage.

Results and Discussion

Results of demographic information of the consumers were presented in **Table 1**, the results showed that most of the households belonged to Agricultural background (63.33%) followed by Private (18.33%), business (13.33%) and Govt. employees (05.00%). Most of them belonged to middle age group of 30-50 years (46.66%), followed by young (31.66%) and old age groups (21.66%) respectively. They had a family size of less than 5 members (26.66%), more than 5 members (73.33%). The income levels were of medium category (66.66%) followed by high income (23.33%) and low income groups (10.00%). Out of total respondent's interviewed 50% completed only primary level, 10% studied up to secondary, 25% accomplished college, and only 15% respondents were found to be illiterates.

Table 1 Demographic information of the consumers

Particulars	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Age		
Young < 30 Years	19	31.66%
Middle 30-50 years	28	46.66%
Old > 50 Years	13	21.66%
Occupation		
Agriculture	38	63.33%
Business	08	13.33%
Govt. Employee	03	05.00%
Private	11	18.33%
Family Size		
> 5 members	44	73.33%
< 5 members	16	26.66%
Annual Income		
Less than Rs. 50,000	06	10.00%
1-2 lakhs	40	66.66%
> 2 lakhs	14	23.33%
Education		
Primary	30	50.00%
Secondary	06	10.00%
College	15	25.00%
Illiterate	09	15.00%

Consumption and Choice of preference of meat on table, the results on the consumption pattern and choice of preference of meat are presented in Tables 2 -15, the respondents were subjected to enquire for their preference of quantity of meat purchase. The quantity of meat purchase varies with various reasons. However the responses to this effect are presented in **Table 2**, It was noted that half of the respondents (41.66%) like to purchase more than 300g and another half would like to purchase 100-200g (41.66%) followed by 200-300g (16.66%) It revealed that most of the people preferred poultry meat (63.33%) followed by mutton (26.66%), chevon (5.0%), beef (5.0%) and very less percentage of people preferred to take pork (3.0%) the data were presented in **Table 3**, and similar types of results were reported by [4] and [5]. Very less percentage of people preferred to take pork and beef. This may be because of the religious restrictions which influences the meat consumption patterns of the people in a religious country like India. Almost highest majority of respondents 71.66% spent more than 200 Rs as monthly expenditure on meat followed by 23.33% spent in between 100-200 Rs and 5.00% respondents are spending less than 100 Rs. The data were presented on **Table 4**.

Table 5, shows the major reasons for consumption of meat were because of its health benefits (41.66%), taste (25.00%), habituated (8.33%), nutritious (11.66%), cheap (8.33%) and nearby availability (5.00%) Frequency of consumption of meat were in **Table 6**, Majority of the respondents prefer to consume meat once in a week (55.00%) few (18.33%) respondents prefer to have twice in a week, (13.33%) prefer to have once in 15 days and to a less extant few respondents (8.33%) prefer to have meat daily followed by once in month and rarely with respondents of (1.66% and 3.33%). Preferred day of consumption of meat is presented in **Table 7**, Majority of the respondents 83.33% preferred to consume on Sunday followed by Saturday (10.00%), Friday (05.00%) and Monday (01.66%). These results were in accordance with [6].

Table 2 Quantity of chicken meat purchased

Particulars	Frequency n=60	Percentage
100-200g	25	41.66%
200-300g	10	16.66%
> 300g	25	41.66%

Table 3 Choice of preference of meat on table

Preference of Meat	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Chicken	38	63.33%
Mutton	16	26.66%
Chevon	03	05.00%
Pork	02	03.33%
Beef	01	05.00%

Table 4 Monthly expenditure on meat

Monthly expenditure on meat	Frequency n=60	Percentage
<100 Rs	03	05.00%
100-200 Rs	14	23.33%
>200 Rs	43	71.66%

Table 5 Reasons for consumption of meat

Reasons for consumption of Meat	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Taste	15	25.00%
Habituated	05	08.33%
Health	25	41.66%
Nutritious	07	11.66%
Cheap	05	08.33%
Nearby availability	03	05.00%

Table 6 Frequency of consumption of meat

Frequency of consumption	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Daily	05	08.33%
Once in a week	33	55.00%
Twice in a week	11	18.33%
Once in 15 days	08	13.33%
Once in a month	01	01.66%
Rare	02	03.33%

Table 7 Day of Preference to purchase meat

Day of Preference to purchase meat	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Sunday	50	83.33%
Monday	01	01.66%
Tuesday	-	-
Wednesday	-	-
Thursday	-	-
Friday	03	05.00%
Saturday	06	10.00%

    Table 8 showed that 36.66% respondents were having current knowledge about nutritive value of meat and 63.33% respondents did not show their knowledge over the nutritive value of meat. The above situation indicated that mostly people are partially aware of the nutritive value of meat. The season is also playing a role in the regular consumption, **Table 9**, shows the Preference of Season as it was more during winter followed by rainy season and summer. Only few respondents expressed that they are eating meat throughout the year, irrespective of the season. This necessitates proper long term planning based on the consumer's preference [4] in specific localities.

Table 8 Knowledge about of nutritive value of meat

Knowledge about of nutritive value	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Yes	22	36.66%
No	38	63.33%

Table 9 Preference of Season

Preference of Season	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Rainy	13	21.66%
Winter	12	20.00%
Summer	02	03.33%
No preference	23	38.33%

Edible By products of choice (Small ruminants and chicken) was presented in **Table 10**, It was noted that 36.66% respondents preferred first to eat intestines, 25.00% had choice of head and 20.00% showed preference for liver, while 11.66% preferred to eat bone and followed by feet 06.66%. For chicken edible by products of choice 46.66% of respondents preferred gizzards, 38.33 % preferred liver and 15.00% preferred heart.

Table 10 Edible By products of choice

Edible By products of choice	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Small Ruminants		
Liver	12	20.00%
Intestines	22	36.66%
Head	15	25.00%
Feet	04	06.66%
Bone	07	11.66%
Chicken		
Liver	23	38.33%
Heart	09	15.00%
Gizzard	28	46.66%

All the rural meat consumers were in favour of fresh meat only [7] and won't compromise on the quality of meat, as they were well aware about the effects of inferior quality meat on health. At the same time majority of respondents (55.00%) were able to detect spoilage either by smell, (25.00%) by tasting, (18.33%) by colour, and to less extent (01.66%) by other methods. This is due to their experience and quality consciousness. The data were presented on **Table 11**, when it comes to place of purchase and consumption of meat almost all people likely to purchase meat from retail shops. But when it comes to consumption 86.66% of respondents preferred to consume meat at home followed by 8.33% restaurants and 5.00% fast food stalls. **Tables 12** and **13**, shows the place of purchase and consumption of meat. Opinion on regular consumption of meat were given on **Table 14**, whereas, 66.66 % of the individuals opined as regular consumption is not good for health. Around 10.00% individuals opined as good for health and few 23.33% could not say any opinion on regular consumption and people said that excessive consumption of meat may lead to heart problems. Similar type of observation was mentioned by [8].

Table 11 Assessment for spoilage of meat

Spoilage	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Tasting	15	25.00%
Colour	11	18.33%
Smell	33	55.00%
Others	01	01.66%

Table 12 Place of consumption

Place of consumption	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Home	52	86.66%
Fast Food stalls	03	05.00%
Restaurants	05	08.33%

Table 13 Place of purchase of meat

Place of purchase of meat	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Slaughter house	-	-
Retail shop	60	100.00%
Super markets	-	-

Table 14 Regular consumption of meat

Regular consumption	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Good for health	06	10.00%
Not good for health	40	66.66%
Can't say	14	23.33%

Finally when it comes to know about the preference of processed meat almost all were not preferred. The reasons for not preferring the processed meats because most of them (75.00%) are habituated to fresh meat, (16.66%) considered fresh meat is more hygienic than processed meat and very less respondents 8.33% have given their opinion as not tried even at once. The data was recorded and presented in **Table 15**.

Table 15 Processed meat

Processed meat	Frequency n=60	Percentage
Preferred	-	-
Not Preferred	60	100.00
No Idea	-	-
Reasons		
Taste will not be good	-	-
Habituated to fresh meat	45	75.00%
Can't change the habit	-	-
Not tried	5	8.33%
Fresh is more hygienic	10	16.66%
Costly	-	-

Conclusion

It was concluded from the present study conducted in Gannavaram rural locality on meat consumption pattern indicated that meat consumption is below the ICMR recommendations of 11kg per annum Most of the respondents preferred poultry meat compared to other meats. Further the religious taboos, social customs and sentiments are coming in the way of consumption of beef and pork. On an average a family consumes 1200 g of meat per month. The households increase their meat consumption in winter season when compared to other. Due to lack of proper education and awareness majority of people do not know about the nutritive value of meat. Hence the meat authorities, meat development corporations, policy makers should come up with evolving strategies for creating awareness among the people regarding the importance of nutritive value of meat so that we can meet the ICMR recommendations.

Reference

[1]   Kayser, M. Nitzkob, S. and Spiller, A (2013) Analysis of differences in meat consumption patterns. International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, 16 (2): 43-56.
[2]   Thammiraju, D. and Suryanarayana M.V.A.N. (2005) Meat consumption in Prakasam district of Andhra Pradesh: an analysis. Livestock Research for Rural Development. Volume 17, Article 130
[3]   Snedecor, GW. and Cochran,WG. (1967) Statistical Methods. 6thedn. Oxford and IBH Publication Comp., Calcutta.
[4]   Srinivasa R M and Thammiraju D. (2010) Meat consumption pattern in Hyderabad city. Indian J. Anim. Res., 44(4): 248-253.
[5]   Jagadeesh Babu, A. Rupa Sundari, A. Triveni, G. and Indumathi J (2010) Study on meat consumption patterns in rural households of Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh. Tamilnadu J. Veterinary and Animal Sciences, 6(4): 183- 187.

[6]   Nagarajkumari K, Naga Mallika E and Ananda Reddy P. (2011) Consumption pattern of chicken meat and meat products in rural areas of costal Andhra Pradesh districts. Indian J. Poult. Sci., 46(1): 132-134.
[7]   Tzimitra K (1997) Greek consumer behavior to meat. Agricoltura Mediterranea. Volume 127:61-69.
[8]   Chen Chun Ming. (1995) Eating patterns – a prognosis for China. Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition Vol.4: 24-28.