Original Research Article

A Comparative Study on Behaviour of Meat Consumers in Rural and Urban Areas of West Bengal

Priyanka Saha[1], A.Goswami[2], D.Mazumder[3] and Biswajit Pal[1*]

[1] Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, West Bengal State University, Barasat, Kolkata-700126, India
[2]Department of Veterinary & Animal Husbandry Extention Education, West Bengal University of Animal and Fishery Sciences, 68, K.B. Sarani, Kolkata-37, India
[3]Department of Agricultural Statistics, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Mohanpur,Nadia,West Bengal, India
*Corresponding author

A B S T R A C T

Keywords

Rural,
Urban,
Meat
consumer,
Meat
Preference

The present study has been taken up to identify the socio-demographic, socio-economic and communication characteristics of rural and urban people relating to meat and meat product consumption. Randomly selected 70 respondents from urban municipal ward and 70 respondents from 1 Gram Panchayat were selected from purposively selected one district of West Bengal .The data were collected with the help of pre-tested structured interview schedule. The collected data were analysed statistically after proper compilation. The study revealed that there exist significant differences of rural and urban mean scores of area on age, gender, family income, religion, caste, education, house type, material possession, communication, preferences of meat score, awareness score and preferences of meat product. Preference of meat was positively and significantly correlated with age in both rural and urban areas. Family meat consumption also has positively and significantly correlation with family type, family size, house type and material possession in both two areas. Awareness and meat preference were positively and significantly correlated with urban contact in both rural and urban areas where as communication score in both areas has positively and significantly correlated with meat preferences.

Introduction

Rearing of animals for meat production was basically a subsidiary enterprise in India with just enough number to cater to the need of the family. Meat and meat products are essential components in modern balanced diet as these provide much needed animal proteins to non-vegetarian population in India. Consumer in any production system plays a vital role around whom the whole system revolves and meat products are no exception to this. With the rising income levels of the consumers and their changing

tastes and preferences, the demand for meat is undergoing a change both in quantitative and qualitative terms (Haun and Fu, 1993). The present study has been taken up to identify the socio-demographic, socio-economic and communication characteristics of rural and urban people related to meat and meat products consumption**.** To know the entrepreneurial status as well as generation of self-employment of the people through the meat sector\industry, the study has been conducted. Keeping in this mind, the general objective of the study was undertaken to know the behaviourial pattern of meat in rural and urban areas of West Bengal.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted purposively selected in North 24 Parganas district of West Bengal. One Village and one Municipal ward were selected purposively to collect the data. The Barasat -1 block was selected purposively in which Fatayabad village under Ichapur Nillganj gram panchayat was selected randomly to collected data from rural area. The Kamarhati Municipality under Barrackpore Sub division selected purposively where randomly selected ward number 26 was taken in sample to collect the data from urban population. From the each location (1rural and 1 urban) 70 numbers of respondents were selected randomly which formed the total sample size of the study were 140 (N=140). The data were collected during March'12 to May'12 with the help of pre-tested structured interview schedule. After computation of data, it was analysed statistically to observe the objective laid down in the study.

Results and Discussion

Mean comparison of area of study i.e. rural vs. urban comparison was made on varying

dependent variables. The present study showed that there exist significant effect of area on age, gender, family income, religion, caste, education, house type, material possession, communication score, preferences of meat score, awareness score and preferences of meat product score (Table-1).

In present investigation mean age of urban area was higher than rural as because the sample respondents who were ready to answer, were young in age at rural areas by chance.

Similarly more respondents in urban area were female where as maximum respondents in rural area were male. That is the reason the mean gender score was higher at urban area.

Mean family income, education, house type, material possession score, communication score, preferences of meat and meat products and awareness score were all higher in urban areas than that of rural areas. Muslim respondents were maximum in rural area and Hindu respondents were maximum in urban area. So the religion score was high in rural area. Rural area consisted of less number of respondents of general caste and so the mean of rural area was higher than urban area.

In rural area family size of the respondents were bigger than urban area. So mean of family size was higher in rural areas than of urban areas. Table.2 showed that preferences of meat score was positively and significantly correlated with age at 1% level of significance and with communication level at 5% level of significance. The study of Dana et.al. (1998) revealed the same. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with marital status at 1% level of significance in rural area.

Table.1 Comparison of Mean between Rural and Urban area

VARIABLES	AREA		Mann-Whitney U	Sig.
	RURAL	**URBAN**		
Age	1.61	2.11	1722.50	**0.00**
Gender	1.34	1.59	1855.00	**0.00**
Marital status	1.51	1.70	2185.00	0.21
Occupation	3.36	3.70	2188.00	0.26
Family income/month	2.89	3.94	970.50	**0.00**
Relegion	1.90	1.00	245.00	**0.00**
Caste	1.14	1.00	2310.00	*0.04*
Education	3.33	5.61	558.50	**0.00**
Family type	1.21	1.14	2275.00	0.27
Family size	1.40	1.23	2030.00	*0.03*
House	2.96	4.17	465.50	**0.00**
Material possession	3.63	4.79	1051.50	**0.00**
Urban contact	6.19	7.09	2101.50	0.14
Communication	4.69	10.73	471.50	**0.00**
Preferences of meat	45.37	52.34	1758.00	**0.00**
Family consumption	11.24	9.39	2030.50	0.08
Awareness	16.73	24.03	452.50	**0.00**
Preferences of meat products	10.94	17.01	1236.00	**0.00**

2. Pearsons Correlation Coefficient of Rural area

Pearson's Correlations				
	pro_sum	**Fcon_sum**	**Awar_sum**	**MpdctSum**
Age	**.641**[**]	-0.202	0.061	**-.257**[*]
Gender	-0.153	**-.467**[**]	**-.333**[**]	**-.447**[**]
Mat_status	**-.335**[**]	**.478**[**]	0.126	**.471**[**]
Ocupatn	0.176	0.059	0.139	0.027
F_Income	0.126	**.500**[**]	**.481**[**]	**.487**[**]
Relegion	-0.008	0.142	**-.358**[**]	-0.044
Caste	0.094	-0.066	0.072	0.019
Educatn	-0.051	*.243*[*]	0.194	**.313**[**]
F_Type	0.061	*.240*[*]	0.069	-0.031
F_Size	0.012	*.294*[*]	0.038	0.223
House	0.074	**.406**[**]	**.414**[**]	**.411**[**]
M_posses	0.123	**.495**[**]	**.573**[**]	**.433**[**]
Urbansum	0.079	**.602**[**]	**.403**[**]	**.596**[**]
com_sum	*.240*[*]	**.696**[**]	**.474**[**]	**.576**[**]

Table.3 Pearsons Correlation Coefficient of Urban area

Pearson's Correlations				
	pro_sum	**Fcon_sum**	**Awar_sum**	**MpdctSum**
Age	**.906****	-0.024	0.081	**-.460****
Gender	**-.388****	-0.223	-.449**	-0.19
Mat_status	**-.333****	-.335**	-0.089	**.368****
Ocupatn	**.476****	-0.216	-0.024	**-.248***
F_Income	**-.312****	-0.028	.289*	0.189
Educatn	0.186	-0.07	0.104	0.108
F_Type	-0.176	**.416****	0.117	0.1
F_Size	-0.001	**.475****	.238*	-0.074
House	-0.048	**.556****	.253*	0.01
M_posses	0.008	**.358****	**.538****	0.107
Urbansum	0.157	-0.028	.278*	**.326****
com_sum	-0.061	0.104	0.212	**.301***

Mat_status= Marital Status, Ocupatn: Occupation, F_Income= Family income, Educatn: Education, F_Type: Family Type, F_Size: Family Size, M_posses: Material Possession, Urbansum: Urban contact total, com_sum:Total Communication score

The survey further showed that family consumption score was significantly and positively correlated with communication level, urban contact, family income, material possession, marital status, and house at 1% level of significance and with family size, family type and education at 5% level of significance. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with gender at 1% level of significance.

The survey further showed that awareness score was significantly and positively correlated with material possession, family income, communication level, urban contact and house at 1% level of significance. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with religion and gender at 1% level of significance.

The survey showed that preferences of meat-products score was significantly and positively correlated with urban contact, communication level, family income, marital status, material possession, house and education at 1% level of significance. Dana et.al. (1998) opined the same. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with gender at 1% level of significance and with age at 5% level of significance.

Table.3 showed that preferences of meat score was positively and significantly correlated with age and occupation at 1% level of significance. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with gender, marital status and family income at 1% level of significance in urban area. The survey showed that family consumption score was significantly and positively correlated with house family size, family type and material possession

at 1% level of significance. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with marital status at 1% level of significance. The survey furthershowed that awareness score was significantly and positively correlated with material possession at 1% level of significance and with family income, urban contact, house and family size at 5% level of significance. The score was negatively significantly correlated with gender at 1% level of significance. The survey revealed that preferences of meat-products score was significantly and positively correlated with marital status and urban contact at 1% level of significance and with communication level at 5% level of significance. The score was negatively and significantly correlated with age at 1% level of significance and with occupation at 5% level of significance.

From the above findings it may be concluded that these exist significant effect of both rural and urban area on age, gender, family income, religion, caste, education, house type, material possession, communication, preference of meat, awareness and preference of meat products etc. It was seen that preferences of meat was positively and significantly correlated with age in both rural and urban area. Further, communication was significantly correlated with preferences of meat in rural area where as occupation was in urban area. Family consumption was positively and significantly correlated with family type, family size, house and material possession in both rural and urban areas. Further, marital status, family income, urban contact and communication were positively and significantly correlated with family consumption only in rural area.

Awareness was positively and

significantly correlated with house, material possession and urban contact in both urban and rural area. But in rural area only family income and communication were correlated with awareness where as in urban area family size was correlated positively. Preferences of meat products were positively and significantly correlated with marital status, urban contact and communication for both the rural and urban areas. Although family income, material possession and house were significantly correlated with preferences of meat only in rural areas.

References

Dana, S.S., Khandekar, N., Sharma, R.P. and Sinha, S.P (1998). Factors affecting adoption of commercial poultry production technologies, Indian journal of Animal Research. 32(1): 1-4.

Huang, C. J. and Fu, J., 1995, Conjoint analysis of consumer preferences and evaluation of processed meat. J. of International Food and Agric. Business Mrkt., 7 : 35-53.

Rubina Hakeem., Thomas, J. and Badruddin, S. H., (1999), Rural urban differences in food and nutrient intake of Pakistani childrer J. of the Pakistan Medical Association, 49(12):288-294.