

# **Literature study on the fat-related preferences of South African consumers**

**Researcher:** Mrs Hester Vermeulen

**Research institute:** Bureau for Food and Agricultural Policy

**Document version:** First complete draft

**Submission date:** 28 February 2018

## 1. Study objective:

To present a review of literature on the fat-related preferences of South African consumers, regarding aspects such as visible fat, marbling and fat colour. This literature review study was requested by the RMRD SA Planning Committee Cattle and Small Stock in a communication dated 4 December 2017.

## 2. Executive summary:

### ***The relative importance of fat among red meat purchase considerations:***

A detailed summary is presented of the relative importance of fat-related aspects among consumers' red meat purchase considerations from various literature sources. In general consumers across the socio-economic spectrum have a strong focus on affordability (price), food safety (including sell-by date or expiry date) and visual appeal (e.g. meat colour, neat cuts, no blood, packaging/presentations) when purchasing red meat. The fat content of red meat was not among these strongly dominant factors, but was still among the important purchase factors of all the reviewed studies with fat-related attributes perceived as 'very important' by more than 75% of beef consumers for example. Specific elements of fat included in the various studies were fat to meat ratio, fat colour, visible fat amount, visible fat distribution and marbling.

Comparing these results to more recent studies suggest that over time price / affordability and fat content has become relatively more important, while sensory- and visual appeal remained important.

### ***Fat within the context of consumers concerns regarding red meat***

Considering consumers' red meat concerns, price / affordability, health concerns and fatty meat were revealed as dominant aspects in numerous past and more recent studies. Specific examples of health concerns involved cholesterol, heart disease, high blood pressure, gout and diabetes.

### ***Consumer preferences pertaining to fat colour***

Even though 70% to 80% of Western Cape middle-income and affluent consumers perceive fat colour as 'very important' only about 50% and 44% perceive 'grass fed' and 'grain-fed' as 'very important' (Vermeulen *et al*, 2018) – suggesting a disconnect in consumers' minds pertaining to the link between fat colour and animal feeding practices.

Among a socio-economically diverse sample of consumers in Cape Town, Maré *et al* (2013) identified three consumer segments based on consumers fat colour preferences: 44% preferred white fat, 14% preferred yellow fat, 42% had no particular fat colour preference.

### ***Consumers' preferences for different types and/or quantity of fat on red meat***

Key observation from a range of literature includes the following:

- In the Eastern Cape leaner red meat options were not generally bought by lower-income consumers due to the price premium usually associated with leaner meat cuts (Rani *et al*, 2013).
- Bloemfontein consumers revealed a preference for external fat but a dislike in seam fat (Shongwe *et al*, 2007).
- Preliminary results from Lombard (2018) indicate that consumers in the Free State indicated a stated preference for medium-fat towards lean red meat cuts.
- Vermeulen *et al* (2017) found that about 60% of consumers had red meat fat concerns. 'Fat concerned' consumers revealed a higher preference for chicken and a higher tendency to shift some intake of red meat towards alternative animal protein foods options (e.g. chicken, fish).
- Preliminary results from the 'eye tracking' study by Lombard (2018) indicate that fat on meat was the meat aspect that on average received attention first from the participants and was fixated on the longest by indication of the average total fixation duration time. This is already an indication of the importance of fat for consumers when purchasing red meat. Once the official

results are released (which integrates the 'eye tracking' results with the survey results) the potential of this approach will be fully illustrated.

#### **Recommendations for future research:**

- As stated by Rani *et al* (2013) the red meat industry could consider research to reduce fat levels in mutton aimed at lower-income consumer brackets.
- In recent years there has been a rise in the adoption of diets involving higher protein and fat levels among particularly wealthier South African consumers. No literature could be found on consumers fat perceptions in this regard or in terms of the impact it could have on the SA red meat industry.
- In-depth research is needed to understand consumers' red meat fat preferences for different red meat cuts and species (e.g. beef mince vs. beef steak; mutton/lamb roast vs. mutton/lamb chops) by taking into consideration different eating occasions and cooking methods. Furthermore consumers' perceptions pertaining to the link between fat in meat and health could be better understood in order to inform improved science-based consumer education.
- Consumers' perceptions, knowledge and behaviour pertaining to white fat and yellow fat on red meat should be investigated from a wider geographical focus on a national level. Part of such an investigation should focus on the identification of current misconceptions regarding fat colour as well as measuring the potential impact of consumer education on behaviour.
- It could be interesting to design one multi-methodological integrated project combining aspects such as the product-focused approach (Shongwe *et al*, 2007), survey-type consumer research (to evaluate choices, perceptions, knowledge and motivations of consumers) as well as 'eye tracking' analyses – to investigate the red meat fat preferences of South African consumers.

### **3. Results:**

Table 1 presents an overview of the various studies evaluated for this literature review, in terms of focus (geographical, socio-economic, product (species, cuts), when conducted, sample size, sampling approach, survey instrument, how respondent interaction was approached, methodology overview and objective of the particular reviewed study. Furthermore, comparative results are also presented on fat-related aspects from market research conducted for the old Meat Board (e.g. Meat Board's Quantitative Survey, 1996; Protein survey, 1996; Quantitative survey, 1997; South African Pork Producers Organisation, 2000).

**Table 1: Summary of background information regarding the reviewed literature on the fat-related preferences of South African consumers**

Reference:	Geo-Graphical and socio-economic focus:	Product focus:	When?	Sample Size:	Sampling:	Survey Instrument:	Respondent Interaction:	Methodology aspects:	Research focus:
Lombard, 2018	Free State Mangaung Municipality  Entire socio-economic spectrum	Beef and mutton/ lamb	2017	n=350	Convenience sampling by means of a interceptive survey – participants approached as they moved past the eye-tracking station in-stores.	Eye-tracking tests & questionnaire	Face-to-face interaction to complete eye-tracking test and questionnaire afterwards.	A Tobii T120 eye-tracker was used. Respondents were shown various images for 5 seconds each. Product variations were based on: meat colour (bright red, dark red, brownish), fat on cuts (very little, medium and large amounts), marbling (yes or no), packaging, classification, price per kilogram, price per pack, nutritional information, brand, breed of animal, quality indicating labels and origin. Data visualisation involved Gaze plots and heat maps. After the eye-tracking test the questionnaire involved demographics, how household eat red meat, cut preferences, what respondents could recall from the eye-tracking images viewed.	To test marketing attributes according to impulsive purchasing behaviour of consumers on beef products. (Eye tracker); To test marketing attributes according to impulsive purchasing behaviour of consumers on mutton products. (Eye tracker); To make recommendations to industry regarding the packaging and marketing of red meat products
Xazela, Hugo, Marume & Muchenje, 2017	Seven villages in the Eastern Cape – Amathole and Chris Hani Districts  Low-income households	Red meat	2017	n=466	Random selection process	Questionnaire	Face-to-face interviews in respondents' homes	Questions focus on: Demographics, meat purchasing decisions, preferred meat products, meat product most consumed at home, ability to tell the quality of meat by visual assessment, consumption patterns and health issues. Likert-type scales applied to measure the importance of visual cues and purchasing decisions and agreement levels with meat quality aspects. Analyses involved frequencies, chi-square analyses, principal component analyses, CALIS equation modelling with root mean square error of approximation used as the primary fit measure.	To determine the perceptions of rural low-income consumers on meat quality and health issues associated with meat consumption.
Vermeulen, Schönfeldt & Pretorius, 2017, 2018	Urban consumers across the socio-economic spectrum in Gauteng and the larger Cape Town area	Beef and mutton/ lamb	Gauteng study: 2012/ 2013 WC study: 2016/ 2017	Gauteng: n=584 WC: n=750	Quota sample to reflect the demographic profile of consumers in upper-middle and wealthy segments, approached with door-to-door recruitment and screening	Questionnaire	Face-to-face interviews in respondents' homes	Questions focussed on: meat purchasing and consumption behaviour (including factors considered when purchasing red meat); motivations and perceptions towards red meat; used and most trusted information sources on red meat; red meat in the context of food-away-from-home; red meat labelling; red meat classification. Types of questions: open, closed options, Likert-rating scale type questions (e.g. perceived importance / trust / usage).	To investigate South African consumer behaviour towards and perceptions regarding red meat

**Table 1 (continued): Summary of background information regarding the reviewed literature on the fat-related preferences of South African consumers**

Reference:	Geo-graphical focus:	Product focus:	When?	Sample Size:	Sampling:	Survey Instrument:	Respondent Interaction:	Methodology aspects:	Research focus:
Marandure, Mapiye, Makombe, Nengovhela, Strydom, Muchenje & Dzama, 2016	Five rural town in the Eastern Cape  Most respondents were from a low disposable income group	Pasture-fed beef produced by smallholder producer	2015	n=155	Consumers at retail outlets in village (meat purchasers for the household)	Questionnaire	Face-to-face interviews	Questions focused on demographics, most preferred beef market, beef purchase frequency, preferred type of beef, purchase factors, previous experience with branded beef, branded beef preferences, willingness to buy, willingness to pay a premium and potential purchase factors regarding pasture-fed beef brand and information that should be included on the label of pasture-fed beef. Analyses involved descriptive statistics, analysis of variance, binary logit modelling.	Perceptions of consumers on the development of a natural pasture-fed beef brand by smallholder producers in the Eastern Cape.
Maré, Taljaard & Jordaan, 2013	Cape Town  Entire socio-economic spectrum	Beef	March 2009	n=471	Random walking method in and around different supermarkets.	Questionnaire	Face-to-face interviews	Types of questions: closed answers, Likert-type scales, ranking questions Research components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demographics</li> <li>Perceived importance via Likert-type scales and ranking</li> </ul> Logit regression models run on different preference groups.	Red meat purchase considerations; Consumer preferences for beef fat colour
Rani, Hugo & Muchenje, 2013	Five municipalities in the Eastern Cape: Buffalo City, Nkonkobe, Nxuba, Lukhanje and Amahlathi municipalities targeting urban and rural towns  Lower- and middle-income consumers	Mutton	2013	215	Random selection of consumers were purchasing mutton from retail outlets in chosen areas.	Questionnaire	Face-to-face interviews	Questions focus on: Demographics, meat purchasing decisions, protein food preferences, preferred meat parts, ability to access the quality of mutton visually, mutton quality perceptions and consumers' health. Analyses involved the construction of frequencies and chi-square tests to investigate associations.	To determine the perceptions of consumers from the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa on the quality of mutton.
Vermeulen & Biénabe, 2010	Gauteng  Upper-middle-income and affluent segments	Beef steak	October to December 2009	n=420	Quota sample to reflect the demographic profile of consumers in upper-middle and wealthy	Questionnaire	Face-to-face interviews	Types of questions: closed answers and ranking tasks Research components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demographics</li> <li>Perceived importance via ranking</li> </ul>	Beef steak purchase considerations, within the larger focus of the study (to investigate the fresh food quality evaluations and perceptions of SA

					segments, approached with door-to-door recruitment and screening				upper-middle-income and affluent consumers)
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Table 1 (continued): Summary of background information regarding the reviewed literature on the fat-related preferences of South African consumers**

Reference:	Geo-graphical focus:	Product focus:	When?	Sample Size:	Sampling:	Survey Instrument:	Respondent Interaction:	Methodology aspects:	Research focus:
Shongwe, Jooste, Hugo, Alemu & Pelser, 2007	Bloemfontein  Lower-income consumers purchasing mainly the fore quarter of the beef carcass not included.	Beef T-bone and rump	March & April 2005	Beef cut samples collected at 16 super-markets	Collection of beef samples and prices at 16 geographically separated supermarkets in Bloemfontein	Collection of data on product price and meat/fat composition aspects	N/A	Beef cut prices were recorded. Beef cuts were subjected to the following analyses: weighing, measuring external subcutaneous fat, dissecting of cuts and chemical fat determination.	Do consumers value beef fat according to beef product type and fat location in the cut?
Taljaard, Jooste & Asfaha, 2006	National focus	Meat in general	Time series data from 1970 to 2003	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applied Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and the Johansen co-integration approach to a conventional demand function taking the following data into consideration: annual time series data of meat consumption and prices, real per capita income	To develop a broader understanding of SA consumer spending on meat with a specific focus on economic and non-economic influencing factors.
Taljaard, Alemu, Van Schalkwyk, 2003	National focus	Meat in general	Time series data from 1970 to 2000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applied a Linear <i>Approximated Almost Ideal Demand System (LA/AIDS)</i> , estimated in first differences to estimate the demand relations for meat (beef, chicken, pork and mutton) in South Africa from 1970 to 2000.	To develop a broader understanding of South African meat demand relationships

### **3.1 The relative importance of fat among red meat purchase considerations:**

Table 2 presents an overview of the relative importance of fat-related aspects among consumers' red meat purchase considerations from various literature sources. In general consumers across the socio-economic spectrum have a strong focus on affordability (price), food safety (including sell-by date or expiry date) and visual appeal (e.g. meat colour, neat cuts, no blood, packaging/presentations) when purchasing red meat. The fat content of red meat was not among these strongly dominant factors, but was still among the 'important' purchase factors of all the reviewed studies.

Interesting observations from the information presented in Table 2:

- Comparing the fat-related results of Maré *et al* (2013) and Lombard (2018) it is interesting to note that the average rating scores for the amount of visible fat and visible fat distribution were very similar in the two studies being in the order of a value of 4 on a scale ranging from 1 (not important) to 5 (very important);
- Research by Vermeulen *et al* (2018) indicated that:
  - When purchasing red meat certain factors are important across the socio-economic spectrum overlapping in the WC and Gauteng (as could be seen in the more detailed results presented in Table 2):
    - Food safety (including food safety, expiry date, clean meat with no blood, shelf life at home);
    - Appearance (appearance in general, visual appeal, colour of meat, colour of fat)
    - Affordability (price)
    - Organoleptic appeal (taste, flavour, eaten by all in family, tenderness, juiciness)
    - General quality (quality guarantee)
    - Fattiness (fat-to-meat ratio)
    - Convenience (easy to prepare)
  - For consumers in the Western Cape fat colour was relatively more important than fat to meat ratio for all consumers when purchasing beef and for low- and high-income consumers when purchasing mutton/lamb.
  - In general consumers perceived fat to meat ratio and low fat or lean meat as important red meat purchase considerations – suggesting a preference towards leaner red meat cuts.

The Meat Board consumer studies of 1996 and 1997 found that the most important factors considered by consumers when deciding to buy meat were: taste (75% and 73% of total samples in 1996 and 1997), meat colour (48% and 46%), amount of fat (45% and 40%), price (36% and 38%), tenderness (30% and 27%), nutritional value (21% and 17%), fresh not frozen (20% and 18%), packaging (17% and 14%), classification (15% and 15%) and preparation time (14% in both years). Comparing these results to more recent studies suggest that over time:

- Price / affordability and fat content has become relatively more important;
- Sensory- and visual appeal remained important.

Taljaard, Jooste & Asfaha (2006) found that the effects of non-economic factors (such as health, safety, convenience, quality, animal welfare and the environment) 'are becoming more important than in the past. The study stressed the importance of the meat industry understanding consumer attitudes and preferences regarding non-economic factors in order to promote red meat demand. The study did not include any specific non-economic factors in their analysis, but treated non-economic factors as an aggregate variable in the model applied.

Taljaard, Alemu and Van Schalkwyk (2003) found that chicken can be classified as a necessity product while beef and mutton can be considered as luxury products (with pork almost being a luxury product). Even though the study did not include any specific non-economic factors, luxury product could potentially involve a stronger consumer focus on non-economic product factors of which fat content might come into consideration. However, no specific fat-related components were evaluated in this particular study.

Evidence from a range of studies presented in this section suggest that fat-related attributes (fat content, low-fat / lean meat and fat colour) has a definite prominent position in the set of factors influencing consumers red meat purchase decisions across the socio-economic spectrum.

**Table 2: Overview of the relative importance of fat-related aspects among consumers' red meat purchase considerations from various literature sources**

<b>Reference:</b>	Maré <i>et al</i> , 2013	Vermeulen & Biénabe, 2010	Rani <i>et al</i> , 2013	Lombard, 2018	Marandure, <i>et al</i> , 2016																																								
<b>Geographical focus:</b>	Western Cape, Cape Town	Gauteng	Eastern Cape	Free State	Eastern Cape																																								
<b>Socio-economic focus:</b>	Entire socio- economic spectrum	Upper-middle-income and affluent consumers	Lower- and middle-income consumers	Entire socio- economic spectrum	Lower-income consumers																																								
<b>Product focus:</b>	Beef	Beef	Mutton	Beef and mutton/ lamb	Pasture-fed beef produced by smallholder producers																																								
<b>Scale applied:</b>	5-point rating scale (1=not important; ...; 5=very important)	Not applicable	Not applicable	5-point rating scale (1=not important; ...; 5=very important)	Not applicable																																								
<b>Meat purchase factors:</b>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>Factor:</b></td> <td><b>Average score:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sell by date</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Price</td> <td>4.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neat packaging</td> <td>4.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neat cuts</td> <td>4.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blood in packaging</td> <td>4.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meat colour</td> <td>4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Fat, fat distribution</b></td> <td><b>4.1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Texture</td> <td>4.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Classification</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thickness of cuts</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Branding</td> <td>3.7</td> </tr> </table>	<b>Factor:</b>	<b>Average score:</b>	Sell by date	4.6	Price	4.4	Neat packaging	4.3	Neat cuts	4.3	Blood in packaging	4.3	Meat colour	4.2	<b>Fat, fat distribution</b>	<b>4.1</b>	Texture	4.0	Classification	3.8	Thickness of cuts	3.8	Branding	3.7	<p>(% in brackets: Share of sample (n=420) listing factors among top three most important purchase factors)</p> <p>Price (98%) Expiry date (91%) Appearance (89%) Quality guarantee (83%) Food safety (65%) <b>Fat content (60%)</b></p>	<p>(% in brackets: Share of sample (n=420) mentioning particular factor as relevant when purchasing mutton)</p> <p>Price (±65%) Quality (±20%) Health (±15%)</p> <p>With superior mutton quality perceived to be linked to: Taste (±40%) Juiciness (±25%) <b>Fatness (±20%)</b> Tenderness (±10%) Colour (±5%)</p>	<p>(NOTE: This is preliminary results obtained from WA Lombard)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>Factor:</b></td> <td><b>Average score:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colour of meat</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neatness of cut</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Visible fat amount</b></td> <td><b>4.1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bone to meat ratio</td> <td>4.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Visible fat distribution</b></td> <td><b>3.9</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blood in packaging</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Classification</td> <td>3.6</td> </tr> </table>	<b>Factor:</b>	<b>Average score:</b>	Colour of meat	4.5	Neatness of cut	4.5	<b>Visible fat amount</b>	<b>4.1</b>	Bone to meat ratio	4.1	<b>Visible fat distribution</b>	<b>3.9</b>	Blood in packaging	3.8	Classification	3.6	<p>(% in brackets: Share of sample (n=155) mentioning particular factor as relevant when purchasing pasture-fed beef)</p> <p>Price (25%) Expiry date (20%) Packaging/presentation (5%) Origin (11%) <b>Fat colour (10%)</b> Nutritional quality (8%) Healthfulness (6%) Lean colour (6%) Ethical quality (1%)</p>
<b>Factor:</b>	<b>Average score:</b>																																												
Sell by date	4.6																																												
Price	4.4																																												
Neat packaging	4.3																																												
Neat cuts	4.3																																												
Blood in packaging	4.3																																												
Meat colour	4.2																																												
<b>Fat, fat distribution</b>	<b>4.1</b>																																												
Texture	4.0																																												
Classification	3.8																																												
Thickness of cuts	3.8																																												
Branding	3.7																																												
<b>Factor:</b>	<b>Average score:</b>																																												
Colour of meat	4.5																																												
Neatness of cut	4.5																																												
<b>Visible fat amount</b>	<b>4.1</b>																																												
Bone to meat ratio	4.1																																												
<b>Visible fat distribution</b>	<b>3.9</b>																																												
Blood in packaging	3.8																																												
Classification	3.6																																												

**Table 2 (continued): Overview of the relative importance of fat-related aspects among consumers' red meat purchase considerations from various literature sources**

<b>Reference:</b>	Xazela, Hugo, Marume & Muchenje, 2017	Vermeulen, Schönfeldt & Pretorius, 2018		
<b>Geographical focus:</b>	Eastern Cape	Gauteng & Western Cape		
<b>Socio-economic focus:</b>	Low-income consumers	Low-, middle- and high-income consumers		
<b>Product focus:</b>	Red meat	Beef		
<b>Scale applied:</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable		
<b>Meat purchase factors:</b>	Price – dominant extrinsic cue; Colour and <b>fat marbling</b> – dominant intrinsic cues. (Thus, visual cues were important to gauge expected meat quality.)  Quality of meat was associated with colour, tenderness, juiciness and <b>leanness</b> .	<b>Factors perceived as 'very important' by 75% or more of the various subgroups when purchasing BEEF: (presented in order of importance)</b>		
		<b>Low-income:</b>	<b>Middle-income:</b>	<b>Affluent:</b>
		<p><b>WC (n=250)</b>                      Rand per packet                      Appearance                      Meat colour                      Clean / no blood                      Packaging size                      Food safety                      Expiry date                      Price/kilogram                      Taste                      Flavour  <b>Fat colour</b></p>	<p><b>WC (n=250)</b>                      Price                      Expiry date                      Juiciness                      Clean meat, no blood                      Visual appeal                      Tenderness                      Appearance                      Taste                      Flavour                      Meat colour                      Quality guarantee                      Food safety                      Easy to prepare                      Succulence                      Convenience                      Eaten by all                      Keepability at home  <b>Fat colour</b>                      Preparation time                      Nutritional value                      Personal preferences  <b>Low fat, lean</b>                      Intended use                      Store where bought  <b>Fat to meat ratio</b>                      Store                      Fresh not frozen</p>	<p><b>WC (n=250)</b>                      Taste                      Price                      Expiry date                      Visual appeal                      Appearance                      Flavour                      Clean meat, no blood                      Tenderness                      Meat colour                      Juiciness                      Food safety                      Quality guarantee  <b>Fat colour</b>                      Succulence                      Fresh not frozen                      Bone to meat ratio                      Eaten by all                      Store where bought                      Easy to prepare                      Store                      Keepability at home  <b>Low fat, lean</b>                      Past experience</p>
<p><b>Gauteng (n=164)</b>                      Price                      Appearance                      Cleanliness                      Quality guarantee                      Colour of meat                      Convenience                      Tenderness                      Expiry date                      Eaten by all in household                      Amount of meat / pack                      Bone-to-meat ratio  <b>Fat-to-meat ratio</b>                      Easy to prepare                      Packaging size                      Preparation time                      Colour of fat                      Taste                      Fresh                      Packaging type                      Juiciness</p>	<p><b>Gauteng (n=171)</b>                      Price                      Colour of meat                      Easy to prepare                      Flavour                      Clean meat                      Food safety                      Taste                      Expiry date                      Juiciness                      Appearance                      Quality guarantee                      Eaten by all in family  <b>Fat-to-meat ratio</b>                      Tenderness                      Visual appeal                      Store where you buy                      Packaging size                      Convenience                      Fresh meat                      Preparation time                      Brand / reputation  <b>Low fat, lean</b>                      Personal preferences                      Succulence                      Keepability at home                      Past experience</p>	<p><b>Gauteng (n=249)</b>                      Taste                      Expiry date                      Price                      Colour of meat                      Food Safety                      Flavour                      Juiciness                      Clean meat                      Appearance                      Tenderness                      Visual appeal                      Quality guarantee                      Eaten by all in family                      Easy to prepare  <b>Amount of fat</b>                      Store where you buy                      Succulence                      Keepability at home                      Personal preferences                      Fresh meat                      Convenience                      Nutritional value  <b>Low fat / lean meat</b></p>		

**Table 2 (continued): Overview of the relative importance of fat-related aspects among consumers' red meat purchase considerations from various literature sources**

<b>Reference:</b>	Vermeulen, Schönfeldt & Pretorius, 2018		
<b>Geographical focus:</b>	Gauteng & Western Cape		
<b>Socio-economic focus:</b>	Low-, middle- and high-income consumers		
<b>Product focus:</b>	Mutton/lamb		
<b>Scale applied:</b>	Not applicable		
<b>Meat purchase factors:</b>	<b><i>Factors perceived as 'very important' by 60% or more of the various subgroups when purchasing MUTTON/LAMB: (presented in order of importance)</i></b>		
	<b>Low-income:</b>	<b>Middle-income:</b>	<b>Affluent:</b>
	<p><b>W Cape (n=250)</b>  Appearance  Rand per packet  Clean, no blood  Meat colour  Packaging size  Taste  Expiry date  Price per kg  Food safety  Flavour  Juiciness  Amount of fat  <b>Fat colour</b>  Natural  Household preferences  Eaten by all  Tender</p>	<p><b>W Cape (n=250)</b>  Expiry date  Price  Taste  Juiciness  Clean meat, no blood  Meat colour  Food safety  Flavour  Quality guarantee  Visual appeal  Appearance  Tenderness  Eaten by all  Succulence  Convenience  Easy to prepare  Keepability at home  Preparation time  Nutritional value  Personal preferences  Intended use  <b>Fat to meat ratio</b>  Bone to meat ratio  <b>Low fat, lean</b>  Store where bought  Brand/Product reputation  <b>Fat colour</b>  Fresh not frozen  Packaging size</p>	<p><b>W Cape (n=250)</b>  Expiry date  Taste  Clean meat, no blood  Price  Appearance  Visual appeal  Flavour  Meat colour  Quality guarantee  Food safety  Juiciness  Tenderness  <b>Fat colour</b>  Fresh not frozen  Amount of fat  Eaten by all  Store  Nutritional value  Succulence  <b>Low fat, lean</b>  Personal preferences  Convenience  Keepability at home  Easy to prepare  <b>Fat to meat ratio</b>  Past purchase experience  Hormone free  Packaging size  Bone to meat ratio</p>
<p><b>Gauteng (n=164)</b>  Price  Appearance  Cleanliness  Colour of meat  Tenderness  Quality guarantee  Bone-to-meat ratio  Expiry date  Convenience  Amount of meat per pack  <b>Fat-to-meat ratio</b>  Eaten by all in family  <b>Colour of fat</b>  Easy to prepare  Packaging size  Fresh  Juiciness  Preparation time  Taste  Packaging type  Flavour</p>	<p><b>Gauteng (n=171)</b>  Appearance  Food safety  Flavour  Price  Quality guarantee  Taste  Meat colour  Juicy  Store where bought  Easy to prepare  Expiry date  <b>Amount of fat</b>  Tenderness  Convenience  <b>Low fat / Lean meat</b>  Fresh  Eaten by all  Package size  Preparation time  Visual appeal  Brand / product reputation  Shelf life at home  Packaging type  Personal preference  Clean meat  Fat-to-meat ratio</p>	<p><b>Gauteng (n=249)</b>  Expiry date  Appearance  Taste  Colour of meat  Price  Flavour  Food Safety  Clean meat  Tenderness  Quality Guarantee  Juiciness  <b>Colour of fat</b>  <b>Amount of fat</b>  Eaten by all in family  Nutritional value  Keepability  Succulence  Easy to prepare  Personal preferences  Store  <b>Fat-to-meat ratio</b>  Fresh Meat  <b>Low fat / lean meat</b>  Convenience  Past experience  Intended use of meat  Natural  Packaging size  Bone-to-meat ratio</p>	

			No additives Preparation time
--	--	--	----------------------------------

### 3.2 Fat within the context of consumers concerns regarding red meat

Table 3 presents a summary of the major red meat concerns among Gauteng and Western Cape consumers according to Vermeulen *et al* (2018), revealing the dominance of price / affordability concerns and health concerns across the socio-economic spectrum in both province. Specific examples of health concerns involved cholesterol, heart disease, high blood pressure, gout and diabetes.

Among low-income consumers in the Eastern Cape, Rani *et al* (2013) also found that consumers' mutton concerns focused on price and fatness. Consumers expressed a specific need for reduced fat in sheep meat linked to health concerns. Xazela *et al* (2017) indicated that the concept of nutritional balance was familiar to 64% of low-income consumers in the Eastern Cape, while 59% were aware of the health risks associated with meat consumption. In this study consumers' also revealed a preference towards boiling meat, in order to avoid adding more fat to meat during the cooking process.

In the context of red meat problems / concerns the Meat Board consumer study of 1996 found that the shares of consumers perceiving meat as:

- 'Expensive': 82% for beef, 93% for lamb and 82% for pork;
- 'High in fat content': 29% for beef, 24% for lamb and 54% for pork;
- 'High in cholesterol': 89% for beef, 95% for lamb and 91% for pork.

The results presented in this section suggest that over time consumers' red meat concerns have remained focussed on affordability, high fat content and health issues.

**Table 3: The dominant red meat concerns among Gauteng and Western Cape consumers according to Vermeulen *et al* (2018)**

	Gauteng (n=164)	Gauteng (n=171)	Gauteng (n=249)
<b>B</b> <b>E</b> <b>E</b> <b>F</b>	<b>Gauteng (n=164):</b> Affordability (40.2%) Health concerns (45.4%) Long cooking time (2.1%)  <b>Western Cape (n=250):</b> Price, affordability (11.2%) Fatty (8.8%) Health: Causes illness in general (5.2%) Takes long to cook (4.8%)	<b>Gauteng (n=171):</b> Price / expensive (17.5%) General health concerns (10.6%) Fatty (5.8%) Takes long to cook (4.7%)  <b>Western Cape (n=250):</b> Price, affordability (56.6%) Takes long to cook (30.2%) Quality improved (24.9%) Fatty (21.5%) Health: cholesterol (20.4%) Not tender (18.6%) Not healthy in general (16.4%) Health: diabetes (15.7%) Health: blood pressure (11.3%) Health: gout (9.1%) Not fresh (6.7%)	<b>Gauteng (n=249):</b> Affordability (35.7%) Fatty (28.5%) Not tender (13.7%) Quality concerns (9.6%) Freshness (7.6%) Long cooking time (5.2%) Health concerns (2.4%) <b>Western Cape (n=250):</b> Price, affordability (9.9%) Not healthy in general (35.7%) Takes long to cook (16.3%) Fatty (16.0%) Quality improved (15.6%) Not fresh (15.1%) Not tender (12.8%) Availability (10.0%) Health: cholesterol (8.6%) Availability of right cuts (7.5%) Health: diabetes (6.2%) Animal diseases (5.8%) Health: gout (5.6%) Animal welfare (5.4%) Health: high blood pressure (5.4%) Misleading grading (5.0%)
<b>M</b> <b>U</b> <b>T</b> <b>T</b> <b>O</b> <b>N</b> <b>/</b> <b>L</b> <b>A</b> <b>M</b> <b>B</b>	<b>Gauteng (n=164):</b> Affordability (40.2%) Health concerns (45.4%) Long cooking time (2.1%) Limited shelf life at home / no cold storage at home (1.0%) Mixed with strange meat (1.0%) Quality concerns (1.0%) Availability (1.0%) <b>Western Cape (n=250):</b> Price, affordability (17.2%) Fatty (11.2%) Health: Causes illness in general (10.4%) Expiry date, freshness (2.0%) Smell bad (1.2%) Health: Causes gout (0.4%)	<b>Gauteng (n=171):</b> Price / Expensive (24.0%) Fatty (11.7%) Health concerns (1.2%)  <b>Western Cape (n=250):</b> Price, affordability (40.8%) Fatty (17.2%) Make me sick (10.0%) Quality (6.4%) Health - high cholesterol (4.0%) Tough (4.0%)	<b>Gauteng (n=164):</b> Affordability (55.2%) Fatty (37.1%) Bad taste (6.0%) Quality concerns (5.6%) Colour (5.2%) Health concerns (4.0%)  <b>Western Cape (n=250):</b> Price, affordability (18.0%) Fatty (10.0%) Make me sick (9.6%) Quality (4.8%) Not fresh (4.4%) Not tasty (3.2%)

	Long cooking time (3.2%) Health- gout (2.8%) Health - diabetes (2.4%) Health - high blood pressure (2.4%)	Health - high cholesterol (2.8%)
--	--	----------------------------------

### 3.3 Consumer preferences pertaining to fat colour

Among a socio-economically diverse sample of consumers in Cape Town, Maré *et al* (2013) identified three consumer segments based on consumers fat colour preferences: 44.4% preferred white fat, 13.8% preferred yellow fat, 41.8% had no particular fat colour preference. Possible reasons presented for the high share preferring white fat were inadequate knowledge on the origin and properties of yellow fat and the possibility that consumers are used to white fat on beef given the dominance of meat from feedlots in the local market. The segment with no particular fat colour preference represented a significant share of the total sample (41.8%) and the authors argued that this group might be persuaded to buy yellow-fat beef through successful marketing. Consumers who preferred yellow fat generally had higher education levels and higher grocery spending and meat spending, were more particular about product freshness and prepared most of their meals at home. Higher education levels could imply that consumers could be more likely to know and understand the origin, properties and benefits of yellow fat and apply these aspects when making red meat purchasing decisions. Consumers who preferred white fat were generally less educated, less discerning about physical meat properties and older.

Marandure *et al* (2016) focused on lower-income consumers in the Eastern Cape to determine consumers' perceptions regarding natural pasture-fed beef produced by smallholder cattle producers (thus linked to the 'yellow fat' product characteristic). More than 80% of consumers were willing to buy natural pasture-fed beef, but a similar share was not willing to pay a premium for the natural pasture-fed beef brand (mainly due to household-level budget constraints). Young consumers and smaller households were generally more willing to pay a premium for a natural pasture-fed beef brand. Consumers' reaction to yellow fat not mentioned explicitly in the article.

Vermeulen *et al* (2018) found that the share of consumers perceiving fat colour as 'very important' when purchasing beef increased with rising income levels (67.2% of low-income consumers, 71.9% of middle-income consumers and 80.0% of affluent consumers within the combined sample in the two provinces). Given the high shares of consumers perceiving 'fat colour' as 'very important' it is clear that fat colour is an important attribute to beef consumers. The study did not investigate specific preferences for white or yellow fat. However, some respondents did reveal associations between yellow fat colour and meat that is old or not fresh in some of the open-ended questions. In the Western Cape survey consumers perceptions regarding grass-fed or grain-fed beef was tested among middle-income and affluent consumers, with the attribute 'grass-fed' being 'very important' to 46.8% of middle-income and 54.0% of affluent consumers, while the attribute 'grain-fed' was 'very important' to a lower share of consumers (41.2% of middle-income and 46.8% of high-income consumers). Thus, even though 70% to 80% of middle-income and affluent consumers perceive fat colour as 'very important' the lower sample shares perceiving grass-fed or grain-fed beef as 'very important' indicates is disconnect in consumers' minds pertaining to the link between fat colour and animal feeding practices.

There is a need to further investigate consumers' preferences and perceptions regarding beef fat colour among a wide geographical audience in South Africa and also to test the potential impact of improved consumer education on consumers' choices. Consumer education could involve the elimination of misconceptions and present consumers with balanced information on fat colour and associated production systems and nutritional implications. There is also a need to investigate consumers' willingness to pay for beef with white or yellow fat.

### 3.4 Consumers' preferences for different types and/or quantity of fat on red meat

- Among low- and middle-income consumers in the Eastern Cape, Rani *et al* (2013) found that lean meat were generally more expensive and not affordable by lower-income consumers. Furthermore lean meat was preferred by older consumers linked to the higher incidence of lifestyle diseases among older adult age groups.

- Shongwe *et al* (2007) investigated the link between beef prices and physical presence of different types of fat. In contrast to expectations, consumers were willing to pay a premium for additional external fat (a 1% increase in external fat thickness increased the average beef price by 0.045%) – suggesting that consumers liked the current external fat levels presented in retailers. The results were linked to the food culture in Bloemfontein and the traditional cooking style of braai being popular. A 1% increase in seam fat was associated with a 0.025% decrease in product price indicating that seam fat is perceived as a negative characteristic. Even though the cost implications of removing seam fat should be considered, the researchers argued that the removal of seam fat could potentially result in increased demand. Marbling fat was not associated with the prices of the considered beef cuts, implying that consumers in Bloemfontein did not take marbling fat into consideration when purchasing the particular cuts. The researchers argued that as ‘cattle in South Africa are slaughtered at a relatively young age before marbling could develop to a significant degree, and hence consumers are not accustomed to marbling’.
- In contrast to some international literature indicating that external fat and seam fat are undesired product characteristics, Bloemfontein consumers only discriminated against seam fat – illustrating the importance of investigating South African consumers’ meat perceptions and behaviour rather than assuming similar behaviour to what is seen internationally.
- Preliminary results from Lombard (2018) indicates that consumers in the Free State indicated the following stated preferences for the level of fat in meat: medium fat - 54.7%, lean - 20.8%, very lean - 12.7%, fat - 7.2%, high fat - 4.6%. Thus consumers expressed a dominant preference for medium-fat towards lean red meat cuts. More in-depth preliminary eye-tracking results from this study is included later in this section.
- Vermeulen *et al* (2017) found that the share of consumers who were concerned about the fat content of red meat were the most significant for low-income and affluent consumers (67% and 69% respectively) and somewhat lower (58%) for middle-income consumers. ‘Fat concerned’ consumers revealed a higher preference for chicken and a higher tendency to shift some intake of red meat towards alternative animal protein foods options (such as chicken and fish).
- In Gauteng (Vermeulen *et al*, 2017) the share of consumers who perceived beef as healthy were 48% of low-income consumers, 25% of middle-income consumers and 31% of affluent consumers – suggesting a decline in beef health perceptions as income levels increase. The share of consumers who perceived mutton/lamb as healthy were significantly less: 15% of low-income consumers, 16% of middle-income consumers and 19% of affluent consumers.
- **Preliminary results on the recent ‘eye tracking’ research by Lombard (2018):**

The project is still in the stage of data analysis and reporting, but the researcher provided some preliminary results to be included in this particular literature review.

In terms of the wide range of meat aspects tested, the aspect that received attention from the largest share of consumers (86%) was the fat on the meat. The low average time to first fixation score (0.8885 seconds) suggest that the fat on the meat was the meat aspect that on average received attention first from the participants and fixated on the longest by indication of the average total fixation duration time (1.0612 seconds).

#### **Test involving two beef steak images placed next to each other:**

- The beef steak on the left: more fat, vacuumed packed on a polystyrene plate;
- The beef steak on the right: less fat, only vacuumed packed.
- An investigation of attention paid to the whole area (meat, fat and packaging) of the two packs show that 90% of consumers fixated on the steak on the left while 92% of consumers fixated on the steak on the right-hand side. Time to first fixation results suggest that on average consumers were more likely to fixate their attention on the high-fat pack first (0.4792 seconds - average time to first fixation) before moving their attention to the low-fat pack (0.7232 seconds).
- Consumers spent on average 1.7041 seconds fixating on the pack of meat on the left and 1.4259 seconds fixating on the pack the the right.
- Measurements of the different meat aspects:

- o 86% of the consumers fixated on the meat (meat only, fat excluded) on both of the cuts. The high fat cut received a slightly longer average total fixation duration (0.9906 seconds) than the low-fat cut (0.9473 seconds).
- o Fat on the high fat steak received fixations from a smaller share of consumers (57%) than on the low-fat steak (63%). It can be noted that despite the fat on the high fat cut received fixations from a smaller share of participant the fat on the high fat cut was fixated on (0.4916 sec.- average total fixation duration) for longer than the fat on the low-fat cut (0.4211 sec.)

***Test involving two beef steak images placed next to each other:***

- The beef sausage on the left: more fat (high fat), vacuumed packed;
- The beef steak on the right: lower fat, vacuumed packed.
- The share of consumers that fixated on the two packs of sausage was relative similar (88% - high fat vs. 89% - low fat). The average time to first fixation proved to be similar (0.6937 seconds vs. 0.6438 seconds) with the low-fat sausage receiving attention slightly earlier.
- Average total fixation duration for the low-fat sausage was longer (1.7092 seconds vs. 1.5663 seconds) and also received more fixations on average per customer (8.2022 vs. 7.8303 seconds).
- The average time to first fixation results for the labelling aspects suggest that all labelling aspects on the low-fat sausage, except for classification, caught consumer's attention at an earlier stage than the labelling equivalents on the high-fat sausage. With the exception of two aspect (Butcher name and sell by date) the percentage of consumers fixating on the labelling aspect of the low fat-fat sausage were higher. These create the impression that the high-fat sausage does not attract consumers attention to it or its labelling, but rather causes consumers to be more focused on the labelling of the low-fat sausage. The fat in the high-fat sausage was fixated on by on average after 2.4237 seconds by 17% of the consumers for an average fixation duration of 0.3290 seconds. On this image, the fat in the packaging (or in the product) seemed less important to consumers as compared to the alternative, where respectively 57% and 63% of the consumers fixated on the fat on the cut of beef at an earlier stage of the test and for a longer period. Part of the explanation could be that since consumers expect to see fat in the beef sausage they would usually not pay a lot of attention to fat. However, as a high-fat and lower-fat sausage is presented in one view, they do engage in more attention to fat in the sausage.

***Test involving sheep meat:***

Sheep meat (mutton/lamb) was tested in the eye-tracking test. The image showed three packs of mutton that represented the following three options: medium fat meat, high fat meat and lower fat-highly marbled meat. Results for the medium fat meat, high fat meat and lower fat-highly marbled meat from the test show that a relative high percentage of the consumers fixated their attention on all three of the packs, 82%, 90% and 89% respectively. The high fat meat scored the highest fixation percentage at 90%, with the lowest time to first fixation (0.3774 sec.) and the longest average total fixation duration (1.4071 sec.). The average fixation count was the highest for the high fat meat (7.1841). Results for the other two packs show that highly marbled meat was fixated on average earlier (1.2523 sec. vs 1.3075 sec.) and fixated on more times (5.4066 vs. 4.0830) and for longer (1.0910 sec. vs. 0.8143 sec.) than the medium fat meat.

The 'eye tracking' methodology presents an interesting option to validate consumers' stated preferences (with their actual visual behaviour). This technique could add value to some of the research ideas mentioned in Section 4 of this report.

**4. References:**

Lombard WA. 2018. Personnel communication on 19 February 2018 regarding 'eye-tracking' study – preliminary results (as project analyses and write-up is still in progress).

Marandure T., Mapiye C., Makombe G., Nengovhela B, Strydom P. & Muchenje V. & Dzama K. 2016. Beef traders' and consumers' perceptions on the development of a natural pasture-fed beef brand by smallholder cattle producers in South Africa. *African Journal of Range & Forage Science*, Volume 33, Issue 3, pp.207–214

Mare F., Taljaard P.R. & Jordaan H. 2013. Consumer preferences for beef with specific reference to fat colour: The case of Cape Town, South Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Management*, Volume 2, Issue 3, pp.141-148

Nielsen. 2003. *Business needs assessment. Research to provide insights to formulate long- and short-term strategy to enhance the competitiveness of South Africa's beef industry*. Commissioned by South African Feedlot Association.

Nielsen. 2004. *Meat. February 2004 omnibus – All informants*. Prepared for SAFA. March 2004.

Rani Z.T., Hugo A. & Muchenje V. 2013. Perceptions of rural consumers on the quality of mutton in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. *Scientific Research and Essays*, Volume 8, Issue 21, pp.921-931.

Shongwe M.A., Jooste A., Hugo A., Alemu Z.G. & Pelsler A. 2007. Will consumers pay for less fat on beef cuts? The case in Bloemfontein, South Africa. *Agrekon*, Volume 46, Issue 4, December 2007, pp.475-493

South African Pork Producers' Organisation (SAPPO), 2000. *Project Babe*. Prepared for the SA Pork Producers' Organisation by AC Nielsen MRA. June 2000.

Taljaard P.R., Jooste A. & Asfaha T.A. 2006. Towards a broader understanding of South African consumer spending on meat. *Agrekon*, Vol 45, No 2 (June 2006), pp.214-224

The Meat Board, 1996. *Quantitative survey*. Prepared for The Meat Board and Grey Advertising by Market Research Africa. July 1996.

The Meat Board, 1996. *Protein survey. Multibus*. Prepared for Grey Advertising and The Meat Board by Market Research Africa. August 1996.

The Meat Board, 1997. *Quantitative survey*. Prepared for The Meat Board and Grey Advertising by Market Research Africa. August 1997.

Vermeulen H. & Biénabe E. 2010a. The quality turn in South Africa: insights from a comprehensive investigation into the food quality behaviours, perceptions and knowledge of South African consumers with a focus on middle and upper socioeconomic groups. *Contributed Paper presented at the Joint 3rd African Association of Agricultural Economists (AAAE) and 48th Agricultural Economists Association of South Africa (AEASA) Conference*, Cape Town, South Africa, September 19-23, 2010.

Vermeulen H. & Biénabe E. 2010b. *Food quality behaviour, perceptions and knowledge of South African consumers – a focus on middle- and upper socio-economic groups*. Unpublished research report prepared for the National Agricultural Marketing Council (NAMC). 8 June 2010.

Vermeulen H., Schönfeldt H.C. & Pretorius B. 2017. *Improved red meat marketing in South Africa*. Final project report submitted to RMRD SA. 6 March 2017.

Vermeulen H., Schönfeldt H.C. & Pretorius B. 2018. *A survey to investigate the perceptions and behaviour of consumers in the Western Cape regarding red meat across the socio-economic spectrum*. Final project report submitted to RMRD SA. 6 February 2018.

Xazela N., Hugo A., Marume U. & Muchenje V. 2016. Perceptions of rural consumers on the aspects of meat quality and health implications associated with meat consumption. *Sustainability*. May 2017 Volume 9, Issues 5:830