Menu

Improved red meat marketing in South Africa

10/14/2017

Improving The Effectiveness Of The Red Meat Industry In Meeting The Needs Of The Modern Consumer Within South Africa As A Developing Country With Socio-Economic Diversity

Industry Sector: Cattle And Small Stock

Research Focus Area:

- **Red Meat Safety, Nutritional Value, Consumerism and Consumer Behaviour**
- **The economics of red meat consumption and production in South Africa**

Research Institute: Bureau For Food And Agricultural Policy (BFAP)

Researcher: Mrs Hester Vermeulen

Research Team

Title	Initials	Surname	Highest Qualification
Prof	Ferdi	Meyer	PhD Agricultural Economics
Prof	HC	Schönfeldt	PhD
Dr	B	Pretorius	PhD

Completion: 2017

Aims Of The Project

- Improving the effectiveness of the South African red meat industry in meeting the needs of the socio-economical diverse consumer market in South Africa through the development of scientifically based recommendations to guide policy development and product development / improvement.
- To identify and characterize consumer market segments among low-, middle- and high LSM consumers in South Africa based on consumers red meat perceptions and behavior – considering a variety of species and meat cuts guided by data availability.
- To develop scientifically based recommendations for the promotion of red meat in South Africa through appropriate marketing messages delivered through suitable communication channels to maintain and / or improve consumers' perceptions and acceptance of red meat – considering a variety of species and meat cuts guided by data availability.
- To engage in GAP analysis in order to identify the discrepancies between the actual current characteristics and ideal characteristics (demanded by consumers) of the red meat product offering on South African retail shelves – considering beef and mutton/lamb and a selection of fresh meat cuts guided by data availability.

Executive Summary

Meat purchasing and preparation behaviour:

- ***Meat purchasing roles:***
  - Marketing information on red meat should have a strong focus on adult women ('wife' or head female in households) as the primary red meat purchasers, but still keeping in mind that all age and genders groups within the household could influence her red meat purchase decision. Given the increased role of the husband / head male on meat purchasing during weekends and when selecting meat to entertain guests, red meat information related to these more social settings should be targeted at both male and female adults.
- ***Factors considered when purchasing red meat:***
  - Across the socio-economic spectrum, for both raw beef and raw mutton/lamb the following factors were important to consumers when making a purchase – and are thus important factors to focus on in terms of red meat production and marketing, no matter which socio-economics group is targeted:
    - Affordability: Price.
    - Appearance: General appearance, colour of meat, colour of fat.
    - Food safety: Food safety in general, expiry date, clean meat (no blood).
    - Quality: Quality guarantee, fresh, fresh not frozen.
    - Sensory acceptability: Tasty, tender, juicy, eaten by all in household.
    - Convenience: Convenience in general, preparation time.
    - Fat: Fat-to-meat ratio, low fat / lean meat.
    - Store where meat is purchased.
  - Among the low-income sample value-for-money considerations such as bone-to-meat ratio, amount of meat per packet and packaging size were also important. The importance of branding and nutritional value increased towards the middle- and high-income samples.
- ***Meal planning:***
  - As consumers across the socio-economic spectrum usually choose the meat for the meal first and then the other dishes it is critical to ensure that red meat is positioned as a popular 'spontaneous' choice in consumers' minds.
  - Consumer education on red meat meal preparation ideas should rely on multiple sources with the dominant sources being 'social' sources and radio for the low-income sample, and recipes, 'social' sources (such as friends, mother), television and magazines for the middle- and high-income samples.
- ***Red meat preparation and cooking:***
  - For beef the most popular cooking methods were stewing, frying and braai. For the low-income group stove-top boiling was also prominent, while roasting and grilling popular cooking methods among middle-income and high-income consumers.
  - When preparing mutton/lamb low-income consumers used frying, boiling and braai, while middle-income consumers mainly used casserole, potjie, braai, roasting and stewing (in order of importance). High income consumers used stewing, braai, roasting, frying and grilling (in order of importance) for lamb/mutton.
  - Among middle- and high-income consumers the time allocated to meat preparation increased during weekends and even more so when entertaining guests. Thus, when targeting these segments with meat preparation information and recipes for more 'social' meals, more complex and longer preparation time can be used. However, during the week these consumers want meat options that are easy and fast to prepare.

Meat consumption behaviour:

- ***Perceived importance of protein food intake:***
  - Considering the statement: 'It is important to eat animal protein foods daily', the majority of high- and middle-income consumers were in agreement (96% of high-income sample versus 86% of middle-income sample).
  - Considering the statement: 'It is important to eat red meat 3 to 4 times per week', a smaller share of high- and middle-income consumers were in agreement (65% of high-income sample versus 39% of middle-income sample).
  - There seems to be a gap for consumer education particularly among middle- and high-income consumers on the recommended healthy intake of red meat and the health benefits associated with red meat.
- ***Protein food intake:***
  - The animal protein food options consumed in largest quantities were (in order of importance):
    - Low-income consumers: Chicken, eggs, beef, chicken offal, fish and beef.

    - Middle-income consumers: Chicken, eggs, fish and beef.
    - High-income consumers: Chicken, beef, eggs and fish.
  - The most frequently consumed animal protein food options were (in order of importance):
    - Low-income consumers: Eggs, chicken offal, chicken meat, canned fish, polony / viennas, boerewors, beef liver and stewing beef with bone.
    - Middle-income consumers: Chicken, eggs, beef mince, fish, boerewors, beef (stewing, steak, roast, sausage), cold meats, mutton/lamb (chops, stew).
    - High-income consumers: Chicken, eggs, beef (mince, stew, steak, sausage), cold meats, pork, fish, mutton/lamb.
  - The results in terms of the most popular meat option and red meat cuts could provide the red meat industry with important market intelligence in terms of actions to ensure the continued popularity of prominent cuts as well as the identification of 'underutilised' cuts. Furthermore, the meat intake data presented in this report could be very valuable from a food intake / nutritional / food security perspective, as it provides more detailed information on the meat consumption patterns of South African consumers.
- ***Changes in red meat intake over time:***
  - A significantly larger share of the low-, middle- and high-income consumers indicated that they consumed less red meat than 2 years before the survey (Beef: 87% of low-income consumers, 75% of middle-income consumers and 80% of high-income consumers; Mutton/lamb: 72% of low-income consumers, 85% of middle-income consumers and 88% of high-income consumers). These shares are significantly higher than previous research (2003) where 45% of the total sample reported reduced beef intake. Red meat was mainly replaced by chicken meat and some fish. The main reasons for reduced red meat intake (similar to past studies) were high prices (expensive) and some health concerns.
- ***Popularity of red meat among household members:***
  - Red meat was generally more popular among adult consumers than among children and teenagers. There might be a growth opportunity for the red meat industry if red meat could be made more appealing to younger consumers, e.g. through innovative product formats, child-friendly recipes and consumer health education.

Meat perceptions:

- About a third of the low-income consumers remove all visible fat before cooking, while about 15% remove some visible fat before cooking beef and chicken. The serving of meat 'pan drippings' originating from the cooked meat applied to about half of the low-income consumers.

Red meat safety:

- When defining red meat safety consumers across the socio-economic spectrum focused on clean meat, clean purchase environment, meat colour, freshness, grading, expiry date, healthiness and good quality.
- Considering the relationship between red meat quality and red meat safety a large share of respondents perceived the terms to the basically the same and being equally important when purchasing red meat.
- The large majority of all respondents (78% to 98% of the various socio-economic sub-samples) perceived food safety as an important factor considered when purchasing red meat. However, only about 13% of the low-income consumers and about a third of the middle- and high-income consumers had red meat safety concerns. It could be argued that consumers 'control' for food safety by carefully selecting their red meat purchase outlets. It is also important to note that food safety seems to be a 'non-negotiable' attribute to consumers – it has to be in place, implying a responsibility on the red meat industry and retailers to ensure the safety of red meat sold to South African consumers.
- The low- and middle-income consumers were most concerned about the safety of beef, followed by chicken, while the high-income consumers were most concerned about safety of chicken and beef.
- The most trusted purchase outlets for red meat are dominated by specific trusted butchery shops and formal major retail chain store, while the most risky purchase outlets for red meat are dominated by hawkers / street vendors, spaza shops, small independent retailers, certain butchery shops and certain chain retailers.

Food-away-from-home:

- The purchasing frequency of take-away meals differed significantly between income groups, with weekly take-away food purchasing observed for 5% of low-income consumers, 19% of middle-income consumers and 29% of high-income consumers. The results confirmed the dominance of

chicken as a popular meat choice among all socio-economic groups, even though beef is also a prominent choice among high-income consumers when purchasing take-away meals.
- The purchasing frequency of restaurant meals differed significantly between income groups, with weekly restaurant food purchasing observed for 6% of low-income consumers, 11% of middle-income consumers and 9% of high-income consumers. In terms of meat types chicken is the dominant option purchased from restaurants by the middle-income group, even though the popularity gap between chicken and beef is less prominent than for take-away meals. Among the high-income sample beef is the most popular option, followed by fish/seafood.
- Challenges facing the red meat industry includes increasing the appeal of beef within take-away- and restaurant meals, particularly among the middle-income group; and increasing the appeal of mutton/lamb within restaurant meals, among middle- and high-income consumers.

Red meat information sources:

- The most highly used and trusted red meat information sources for the particular socio-economic sub-segment were the following:
- Low-income consumers: TV, radio, advertising, doctors, newspapers;
- Middle-income consumers: TV, family, friends, doctors, recipe books, radio, food labels;
- High-income consumers: Family, friends, food labels, recipe books, butcheries, doctors, dieticians.
- Doctors are among top 10 most used and most trusted meat info sources for ***all*** income sub-segments;
- TV and radio are the top 10 most used and most trusted meat info sources for middle income and low income sub-segments. However, the particular channels / stations will vary between LSM groups.
- Family and friends (possibly linked with social media), recipe books and food labels are among the top 10 most used and most trusted meat info sources for middle income and high income sub-segments.
- Advertising and newspapers are among the top 10 most used and most trusted meat info sources for low income sub-segment only, while butcheries and dieticians among top 10 most used and most trusted meat info sources for high income sub-segment only.

Red meat classification:

- Among low LSM consumers there is a very limited understanding and attention given to red meat classification. Even though middle LSM and high LSM consumers also have a limited understanding of red meat classification, around half of these sampled consumers check the grading / classification mark sometimes or often when buying beef or mutton/lamb.
- The association of red meat classification with meat quality and safety was limited. Even though many respondents did not mention red meat classification / grading directly when defining red meat quality and safety, many aspects related to it was mentioned such as freshness, meat colour, appearance, smell, tenderness, taste and leanness.
- Among an extensive range of red meat decision factors 'grading / classification' was not among the top 20 most important factors. However, many aspects related to red meat grading / classification was important such as appearance, taste, flavour, quality guarantee, meat colour, fat content, juiciness and tenderness.
- It is interesting to note that the results presented on the radar plots in terms of consumers' red meat decision factors, the place of purchase is a stronger quality cue to consumers than the certification marks on the meat. This is an important observation and should be further investigated.

Credence / intangible red meat attributes:

- The most popular intangible attributes among the middle-income consumers were (in order of importance) (% of sample perceiving attribute as 'very important' indicated in brackets): environmentally friendly production (54%), free range (49%), no growth hormones given to animals (44%), animal friendly production (44%), breed of animal (43%) and no GM feed given to animals (43%). The question however arises whether these consumers have the purchasing power to afford the price premiums associated with these attributes.
- The most popular intangible attributes among the high-income consumers were (in order of importance) (% of sample perceiving attribute as 'very important' indicated in brackets): no growth hormones given to animals (56%), no GM feed given to animals (49%), environmentally friendly production (48%), animal friendly production (39%) and free range (36%).
- In terms of demographic variables (LSM group, gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, household income level and education level), within the middle- and high-income samples, the segments

deeming intangible attributes as 'very important' did not differ significantly from the alternative segments.

- The most highly used and highly trusted red meat information sources among the middle- and high-income consumer samples for consumers who perceived at least four or more of the intangible attributes as 'very important' were TV, family friends, advertising, food labels, recipe books, newspapers, butchers, radio, magazines, retailers, dieticians, food industry, public health recommendations, doctors, farmers and consumer organisations. These results (presented for each intangible attribute separate in the particular chapter) present marketers of red meat with a valuable overview of the marketing channels to use when marketing red meat products with particular intangible product traits.

Market segmentation for specific beef and mutton/lamb cuts:

- Market segmentation for individual red meat cuts were based on respondents' consumption frequency for the various cuts, considered at four consumption frequency levels: weekly ('weeklies'), 1 to 3 times per month ('monthlies'), occasionally ('occasionals') and never ('non-users').
- Among the low-income consumers the most popular red meat cuts (with the highest shares of 'Weeklies' and 'Monthlies' combined) were: offal in general (78.8%), beef stew (67.1%), beef mince (46.7%) and beef steak (43.0%). Offal was significantly more important among the low-income sample compared to the wealthier samples.
- Among the middle-income consumers the most popular red meat cuts (with the highest shares of 'Weeklies' and 'Monthlies' combined) were: beef mince (89.6%), beef stew (84.2%), beef steak (59.1%), beef roast (48.5%), mutton/lamb chops (39.7%), offal in general (32.8%) and mutton/lamb roast (31.6%).
- Among the high-income consumers the most popular red meat cuts (with the highest shares of 'Weeklies' and 'Monthlies' combined) were: beef mince (95.1%), beef stew (83.8%), beef steak (79.9%), mutton/lamb chops (69.4%), beef roast (60.5%), mutton/lamb stew (56.0%) and mutton/lamb roast (28.7%).
- In terms of ***demographic variables*** the results indicated that consumers' consumption frequency of red meat cuts did not generally differ in terms of household's size and income as well as the respondent's gender, age and ethnic group. However, the more aggregated wealth level of consumers (in other words whether they were among the low-, middle- or high-income samples) did make a differences in terms of their red meat intake frequency – with more frequent intake generally associated with higher income brackets.
- In terms of ***typical weekly expenditure on particular red meat cuts***, more regular low-income consumers revealed a tendency to spend more on red meat considering the segments for beef mince and beef steak. More regular middle-income consumers revealed a tendency to spend more on beef mince, beef steak, beef stew, beef roast, mutton/lamb chops and mutton/lamb roast.
- In terms of ***typical quantity of raw red meat consumed per week***, more regular middle-income consumers revealed a tendency to consume a larger weekly quantity of beef mince, mutton/lamb chops, mutton/lamb roast, mutton/lamb stew. More regular low-income consumer revealed a tendency to consume a larger weekly quantity of beef offal and mutton/lamb offal. The lack of significant differences for the other cuts within the three main samples once again imply that since more regular consumers and less regular consumers of red meat consume a similar quantity of red meat per week, the more regular segments could be consuming smaller quantities per (more regular) eating occasion.
- For the various red meat cuts, considered for the low-, middle- and high-income samples, this section also presented information on consumers' perceptions regarding beef and mutton/lamb, purchase factors, and best information sources to use to provide consumers with red meat information.
- Across red meat cuts and socio-economic samples, consumers were very consistent in terms of their requirements for red meat labels, with preferences for detailed information and reliable information, date information (use-by date, sell-by date, last day of processing) and information pertaining to production processes (particularly in terms of the use of antibiotics / hormones and also free range in some cases).

Red meat labelling – What do consumers want and what do they see on labels?

- The red meat labelling aspects that are highly desired by consumers and were widely observed on fresh red meat labels were: price, quality guaranteed, sell-by date and brand.
- Despite being very important to consumers, labelling information relating to fat content, nutritional value and classification were not commonly observed on the fresh red meat labels.

- In terms of date information packaging date, sell-by date and expiry date were the most commonly found on fresh red meat labels.

POPULAR ARTICLE

Red Meat Consumer Education – Key Messages And Marketing Channels Focusing On Beef

Mrs Hester Vermeulen, Bureau for Food and Agricultural Policy

Prof Hettie Schönfeldt, University of Pretoria

Dr Beulah Pretorius, University of Pretoria

Acknowledgements: Project funding provided by Red Meat Research and Development SA (RMRD-SA)

PLEASE NOTE:

'Background' pictures /photos of the following could work well with this article:

- Consumer buying beef in a shop
- Consumer preparing beef in kitchen
- Eating beef in a restaurant
- Braai with beef on the grid
- Example of a nutritional label from a beef product

Introduction:

The share of South African adults within the various socio-economic sub-groups changed significantly from 2005 to 2015, with the marginalised consumers decreasing by 52%, the middle class increasing by 50% and the more affluent consumer group increasing by 32%. The future of the South African red meat industry relies on an industry that are profitable and able to adapt to changes in consumer demand, the production environment and sustainability.

In 2012 the South African red meat industry commissioned a comprehensive consumer study to investigate the red meat behaviour and perceptions of the South African low-, middle- and high-income consumers in Gauteng amongst 586 consumers. The study sample was designed to reflect the income, ethnic and age groups of the South African population. The focus of this article is specifically on the identification of key marketing messages and marketing channels for red meat marketing.

How do South African consumers perceive beef?

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements involving potential attributes of beef, pertaining to health / nutrition, affordability, product usage, product procurement, preparation, sensory quality and potential negative aspects.

Considering the positive perceptions of consumers regarding beef, there is significant overlap between income groups involving the following:

- Product procurement: Beef is easy to obtain.
- Product usage: Consumers know how to prepare beef, it is easy to cook the meat, it is versatile, good for entertaining and ideal for braai.
- Sensory quality: Beef is tasty and tender and it does not smell bad.
- Health / nutrition: Beef is a source of good quality protein and iron, it is nutritious and helps the body grow.
- Product origin: Beef is locally produced and not imported.

The aspects which dominated the 'positive' set for beef of all income groups were: versatile, tasty, know how to prepare it, easy to obtain, good for entertaining, easy to cook and good quality protein source. Popularity when eating in a restaurant was also applicable to the middle-class and more affluent group, with higher importance in the latter group. Furthermore the more affluent group was also positive about further health / nutrition aspects (such as 'healthy' and 'contains iron'), shelf life at home ('does not go off fast') and affordability ('value for money' and 'not a luxury').

Among marginalised and middle-class groups the major concerns (i.e. negative perceptions) focused on beef being expensive, having long cooking times and could cause health problems. Among the more affluent consumers the major beef concerns focused on specific health aspects (high in cholesterol, could cause health problems, can make me ill) and long cooking times required. A significantly larger share of the low-income sample was negative towards beef in terms of the following beef aspects: expensive, long cooking times required, can make me ill, high in fat and 'not good for the heart'. In general a higher share of the marginalised group was in agreement with these negative aspects pertaining to beef, in contrast to a lower share of the more affluent consumers. As would be expected, consumers' concerns regarding the affordability of beef decreased as income levels increased.

How do these perceptions translate into marketing messages to promote SA beef?

To enhance beef consumption in the South African context key marketing messages needs to take these observed perceptions into account. Beef product attributes and perceptions and translated marketing messages are proposed in

Table 1.

Product usage and preparation:

Across the socio-economic spectrum consumers were very positive about beef being versatile, easy to cook, knowing how to prepare it, good for entertaining and ideal for braai. The industry could invest or continue to invest in product- and recipe development to ensure that beef remains versatile, familiar, easy-to-cook, 'trendy' and a number one choice when entertaining of having a braai. Innovative ways to reduce beef cooking time for consumers with limited time should also be investigated, as well as innovative and tasty recipes to 'stretch' beef in dishes. However, it is important to consider the varying life styles, preferences and budgets of the socio-economic sub-groups in the process.

Sensory appeal:

All consumer segments were very positive about beef being tasty and not smelling bad. The middle-class was more positive about the tenderness of beef, even though tenderness was among the positive perceptions of all sub-groups. Sensory appeal is a critical product attribute for beef, even more so given its price premium about chicken meat. Production and product handling practices should continuously be improved, based on sound scientific research, to ensure 'better beef' – satisfying the sensory enjoyment needs of consumers of all income groups (e.g. in terms of taste, tenderness, smell and visual appeal).

Health – food safety:

Only the more affluent group was very positive about beef not spoiling fast at home. The lack of cold-storage facilities in the homes of lower-income consumers could contribute to this observation. However, there seems to be a need for consumer education on safe meat handling practices, particularly among the marginalised and middle-class groups.

Health – nutritional value:

All consumers perceived beef as being nutritious, a good quality protein source, helps the body grow and being a source of iron. Only the more affluent group were very positive about beef being 'healthy'. The research results suggest that consumers (across the socio-economic spectrum) need to be educated on the nutritional value of beef, pertaining to various aspects such as macro-nutrients (i.e. protein, fat) and micro-nutrients (i.e. vitamins and minerals). However, it should be kept in mind that the complexity of nutritional information communicated to consumers should be tailored to their typical educations levels.

Health – fat & cholesterol:

Over the last decade or two a growing body of scientific publications confirm the trend of consumers moving towards leaner red meat cuts. In this study consumers were concerned about beef in terms of fattiness, being high in cholesterol and the intake of beef linked to heart disease – with the marginalised group being particularly negative. Addressing consumers' red meat fattiness concerns is critical, even more so in the light of the rising prevalence of overweight and obesity in South Africa. Corrective actions could include the following:

- Presenting consumers with leaner beef cuts (e.g. through animal production processes and / or trimming of fat from beef cuts before sale).
- Consumer education on the tasty preparation of leaner beef cuts (including aspects such as fat trimming at home and avoiding excessive fat intake through actions such as serving pan-drippings with meat with a high fat content).
- Presenting consumers with a balanced and scientifically sound view on issues pertaining to beef fattiness, cholesterol and heart disease.

Product origin:

All consumers were positive that the beef they buy is usually local meat, suggesting some loyalty to locally produced beef. This is even more important if the large quantity of chicken being imported into the country is considered. The industry could do much more to communicate the origin of beef to consumers and extract some value from consumers' loyalty towards locally produced meat.

Table 1: Proposed key marketing messages translated from consumers' perceptions regarding beef meat

Product attributes and perceptions	Key marketing strategies and messages
Product usage and preparation:	
• Versatile • Easy to cook • Knowing how to prepare • Good for entertaining • Ideal for braai	ü Continuous product- and recipe development to ensure that beef remains versatile, familiar, easy-to-cook, 'trendy' and a number one choice when entertaining or having a braai ü Tasty recipes to 'stretch' beef in dishes ü Innovative ways to reduce beef cooking time
Sensory appeal:	
• Beef is tasty • Beef is tender • Does not smell bad	ü Improved production and product handling practices based on sound scientific research, to ensure 'better beef'
Health – food safety:	
• Beef do / does not spoil fast	ü Consumer education on safe meat handling practices
Health – nutritional value:	
• Beef is nutritious • Beef is a good quality protein source • Beef helps the body grow • Beef is a source of iron • Beef is too fatty • Beef is high in cholesterol	ü Consumer relevant education on the nutritional value of beef, pertaining to various aspects such as macro-nutrients (i.e. protein, fat) and micro-nutrients (i.e. vitamins and minerals). ü Leaner beef cuts ü Consumer education on the tasty preparation of leaner beef cuts ü Presenting consumers with balanced and scientifically sound messages on issues pertaining to beef fattiness, cholesterol and heart disease

• Eating beef causes heart disease	
Product origin & Affordability:	
• Beef is locally produced • Expensive	ü Communicate the origin of beef to consumers ü Address affordability issues through promoting it as an 'essential luxury' or by providing more affordable meat cuts to the consumer

Which communication channels are most suitable to communicate these marketing messages to SA consumers?

Being presented with a list of potential red meat information sources, consumers were asked to evaluate the usage and trust of these sources. Table 2 summarised the most used and trusted information sources amongst the different consumer groups to use in marketing strategies. However, given the diversity of the market the specific channels (e.g. which television channels or which newspapers) as well as the complexity of marketing messages has to be tailored to the behaviour and education levels of the targeted consumers.

Table 2: Highly used and highly trusted red meat information sources *(Source: Survey data)*

Category:	**Information source:**	**Marginalised group:**	**Middle-class group:**	**More affluent group:**
Printed information sources:	**Magazines**	ü	☺	☺
	Newspapers	☺	ü	û
	Recipe books	ü	☺	☺
	Food labels	ü	☺	☺
	Advertisements	☺	ü	ü

Medical information sources:	**Doctors**	☺	☺	☺
	Dieticians	û	ü	ü
Retail information sources:	**Retail stores**	ü	ü	û
	Butchers	ü	ü	☺
Social information sources:	**Family**	ü	☺	☺
	Friends	û	☺	☺
Broadcasting information sources:	**Television**	☺	☺	☺
	Radio	☺	☺	û
Other information sources:	**Public health recommendations**	ü	ü	ü
	The food industry	û	û	ü

*(NOTES: ☺***:** *Indicates red meat information sources that dominates for the particular sub-group)*

Conclusions and implications

Red meat consumption lags behind white meat consumption in South Africa and is losing ground steadily. Marketing efforts to stimulate the consumption of red meat among consumers should build upon aspect where consumers are already positive about beef such as: versatility, know how to prepare, good for entertaining, taste and nutrition (a nutritious meat and a good quality protein source). Furthermore the negative perceptions (affordability, fat and cholesterol content, long cooking time and could be a cause of health problems) should be improved.

Given the dynamic nature of the South African consumer environment with constant socio-economic changes and the influence of global consumer trends, the preferences and behaviour of South African consumers have a very dynamic nature. Subsequently it could be particularly valuable for the South African red meat industry to engage in follow-up surveys of this nature every few years in order to keep track of these dynamic changes.

Please contact the Primary Researcher on the project if you need a copy of the comprehensive report – Hester Vermeulen on hester@bfap.co.za

Animal Products, Cattle and Small Stock, Consumerism and Consumer Behaviour, Nutritional Value, Red Meat Consumption, Red Meat Safety

2017, BFAP, CSS, Paper, Vermeulen

‹ Amino acid composition of South African beef

› Heartwater survey on changes and causes

DEADLINES for RESEARCHERS 2021

Proposals for 2021: TBC
Progress reports: 28 Jan 21
Final reports: 29 Jan 21 Final includes comprehensive report and popular article

COMMITEE MEETINGS for 2021

RMRDSA CSS Planning - TBC
Project Committee - TBC
Pork Planning - TBC

Calendar

< Apr 2021 >

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Tur	Fri	Sat
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

PORK Priority Areas

Cattle & Small Stock Programmes

1 Sustainable natural resource utilisation

2 Improvement of Livestock production and forage

3 Management of agricultural risk to create a resilient Red Meat sector

4 Sustainable health and welfare for the Red Meat sector

5 Enhancement of production and processing of Animal Products

6 Consumer and market development of the Red Meat sector

7 Commercialisation of the emerging sector