



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

T. Senthilkumar¹ and V. Muralidhar^{2,*}

¹Directorate of Extension Education, Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai - 600 051.

²Veterinary Officer, Mandya, Karnataka.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 2 February 2016;

Received in revised form:
26 March 2016;

Accepted: 31 March 2016;

Keywords

Meat,
Consumers,
Locations,
Preferences.

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.

© 2016 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

In developing countries, culture plays a crucial role in determining food patterns. As Indians, are controlled by the traditions and customs, the dietary habit is significantly influenced. In Indian context, culture, traditions, customs and taboos influence meat consumption to a great extent especially in the rural societies. However, studies showed that urbanization has been causing a rise in demand for meat products. As people move to cities, they adapt to get into meat consumption. The difference in consumption and production methods correlates strongly with the overall economy of a country. India is the country that consumes the least meat per capita (Tepper, 2012). In India, cultural differences are also accountable for variations in meat consumption patterns. The differences in food consumption exists across regions, states and in demographic situations. There is also a vast variation in the per capita consumption of meat and livestock products across the states, regions and in living situations like rural and urban areas (Gandhi and Zhou, 2010).

The study was therefore undertaken to assess the meat consumption behaviour among the rural, semi-urban and urban community by collecting information from the meat consumers and non-meat consumers on demographical parameters, consumer preferences, on meat consumption and socio-economic factors affecting meat consumption.

Methodology

The sources of meat purchased in the present study referred to meat purchased at retail shops, supermarkets, company outlets, branded farm outlets and other locations such as community slaughtering places or self slaughtering at home. Interview method was followed for data collection and the Garrett's ranking technique was adopted for the present study. The respondents were asked to rank the appropriate factors on a five point continuum ranging from 'very high' to 'very low'. The orders of merit thus given by the respondents

were converted into per cent position by using the following formula.

$$\text{Per cent position} = 100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$$

Where, R_{ij} -Rank given for i^{th} factor by j^{th} individual
 N_j - Number of factors ranked by j^{th} individual.

The per cent position for each rank thus obtained was converted into scores by referring to the table given by Garrett and Woodworth (1969). Then the mean scores were calculated for each factor and the appropriate rank was given based on which the results were interpreted and discussed.

Results and Discussion

The meat consumers preference towards the source of meat purchased among the rural, semi-urban and urban locations were analysed using Garrett's ranking technique and the results are presented in the table below:

Study areas Source of meat purchased	Rural Households (n=30)		Semi-urban households (n=30)		Urban Households (n=30)	
	Mean score	Rank	Mean score	Rank	Mean score	Rank
Retail shop	95.35	I	95.56	I	95.45	IV
Super market	92.65	III	93.45	II	99.56	I
Company outlet	91.76	IV	89.34	IV	96.34	III
Branded farm outlet	90.45	V	90.34	III	97.34	II
Others	93.45	II	91.23	V	93.56	V

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.

References

Babu, A.J., A.R. Sundari, G. Triveni and J. Indumathi, 2010. Study of meat consumption patterns in rural households of Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh. *Tamilnadu J. Veterinary & Animal Sciences*, **6**(4): 183-187.

Bahl, S., 2012. Consumer behaviour towards food retailing system. *Arth Prabhand: A Journal of economics and Management*, **1**(4): 39-53.

Deshmukh-Taskar, P., T.A. Nicklas, S.J. Yang and G.S. Berenson, 2007. Does food group consumption vary by differences in socioeconomic, demographic, and lifestyle factors in young adults? The Bogalusa Heart Study. *J. Am. Diet Assoc.* **107**(2): 223-234.

Ellis, F., 2000. Rural livelihood and diversity in developing countries. *Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK*.

Gandhi, V.P and Z.Y. Zhou, 2010. Rising demand for livestock products in India: Nature, Patterns and Implication. *Australasian Agribusiness Review*, **18**: 103-135.

Garrett, E.H. and R.S. Woodworth, 1969. Statistics in psychology and education. *Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd., Bombay*, pp. 329.

Hugar, L.B. and H.S. Vijayakumar, 1996. Dynamics of consumer behaviour in vegetable marketing. *Bihar Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, **4**(4): 346-351.

Pavithra, B.S., H. Basavaraja, V.R. Kiresur, S.B. Mahajanshetti and S.N. Mageri, 2009. An economic analysis of food consumption pattern in Karnataka. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.* **22**(4): 840-845.

Reddy, M.S and D.T. Raju, 2010. Meat consumption pattern in Hyderabad city. *Indian Journal of Animal Research*, **44**(4): 248-253.

Saha, P., A. Goswami and D. Mazumder and B. Pal, 2014. A Comparative Study on Behaviour of Meat Consumers in Rural and Urban Areas of West Bengal. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.* **3**(8): 653-657.

Senthil Kumar, G. and N. Meghanathan, 2005. Consumption pattern of mutton in Chennai city. *Tamil Nadu Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences*, **2**(3&4): 86-88.

Tepper, R., 2012. World's meat consumption: Luxembourg eats the most per person, India the least. *The Huffington Post*.

Thammi Raju, D and M.V.A.N. Suryanarayana, 2005. Meat consumption in Prakasam district of Andhra Pradesh: An analysis. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, **17**(11):1-9.