Preference of rural, semi-urban and urban meat consumers about the meat purchasing locations in Karnataka
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ABSTRACT

In Indian context, culture, traditions, customs and taboos influenced meat consumption to a great extent especially in rural societies. The cultural differences within a state and between states are also accountable for variations in meat consumption patterns. A study was performed to ascertain the preference of consumers towards the meat purchasing locations among rural, semi-urban and urban households in Karnataka with sample size of 90 meat eating respondents and 30 non-meat eating respondents. The Garrett’s ranking technique was adopted for the present study. The results showed that the respondents of rural and semi-urban area had better opportunity to purchase meat at retail shops whereas the respondents of urban area had opportunity to purchase meat at supermarkets due to their living conditions, standard life style and work nature.
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Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study areas</th>
<th>Source of meat purchased</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Semi-urban households (n=30)</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Urban households (n=30)</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Retail shop</td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>95.56</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super market</td>
<td>92.65</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>99.36</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company outlet</td>
<td>91.76</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>89.34</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>96.34</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branded farm outlet</td>
<td>90.45</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>90.34</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>97.34</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>91.23</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>93.56</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table revealed that, in rural areas, the source of purchase of meat was at ‘retail shops’ which ranked ‘first’ with an average mean score 95.35 followed by other locations like community slaughtering places or self-slaughtering (93.45), super markets (92.65) and company outlets (91.76). The ‘branded farm outlet’ was ranked ‘fifth’ with an average mean score of 90.45.

In semi-urban area, the source of purchase of meat at ‘retail shops’ ranked ‘first’ with an average score of 95.56.
followed by super market (93.45), others locations like community slaughtering places or self-slaughtering (91.23) and branded farm outlets (90.34). The meat purchased at ‘company outlets’ ranked ‘fifth’ with an average mean score of 89.34.

In urban area, the purchase of meat at ‘super markets’ ranked ‘first’ with an average mean score of 99.56 followed by branded farm outlets (97.34), company outlets (96.34) and retail shops (95.45). The meat purchased at ‘other locations’ viz., community slaughtering places or self-slaughtering ranked ‘fifth’ with an average score of 93.56.

**Conclusion**

It is evident from the study, that the respondents of rural area and semi-urban preferred to purchase meat at retail shops. Whereas the respondents of urban area preferred to purchase meat at supermarkets. This showed that the meat consumption was influenced by source of purchase also.
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