



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

FS 01-17

October, 2001

**COMPARISONS OF HISPANIC HOUSEHOLDS' DEMAND
FOR MEATS WITH OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS**

Bruno A. Lanfranco, Glenn C. W. Ames and Chung L. Huang

**COMPARISONS OF HISPANIC HOUSEHOLDS' DEMAND
FOR MEATS WITH OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS**

Bruno A. Lanfranco, Glenn C. W. Ames and Chung L. Huang(*)

Paper presented at the
Food Distribution Research Society
Annual Conference, Mesa, Arizona
October 14-17, 2001

(*)Graduate Research Assistant and Professors, respectively, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, The University of Georgia, 315 Conner Hall, Athens, GA 30602-7509; Phone: (706) 542 0757; Fax: (706) 542 0739;

Email: games@agecon.uga.edu or chuang@agecon.uga.edu

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences
Department of Agricultural & Applied Economics
The University of Georgia

COMPARISONS OF HISPANIC HOUSEHOLDS' DEMAND FOR MEATS WITH OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS

Bruno A. Lanfranco, Glenn C. W. Ames and Chung L. Huang

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to analyze the demand patterns of Hispanic households for meats in comparison with other ethnic groups using data from the 1998 *Consumer Expenditure Survey*. A system of demand equations of the LinQuad form were estimated for ten meat products using an incomplete system of censored equations. Hispanic households showed a clear preference for beef. Price, income and household size elasticities were estimated for each meat product by ethnic group. The demand for ground beef was the most income inelastic product regardless of ethnicity. Household size had a positive effect on the probability of consuming a particular meat product but a negative effect on actual item expenditures.

Key words: Demand Analysis, Meats, Ethnic Groups

JEL codes: D12, D11

Faculty Series are circulated without formal review.

The views contained in this paper are the sole responsibility of the authors.

The University of Georgia is committed to the principle of affirmative action and shall not discriminate against otherwise qualified persons on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age physical or mental handicap, disability, or veteran's status in its recruitment, admissions, employment, facility and program accessibility, or services.

Copyright © 2001 by Bruno A. Lanfranco, Glenn C. W. Ames and Chung L. Huang. All rights reserved. Readers may take verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Comparisons of Hispanic Households' Demand for Meats with Other Ethnic Groups

Abstract

The objective of this research was to analyze the demand patterns of Hispanic households for meats in comparison with other ethnic groups using data from the 1998 *Consumer Expenditure Survey*. A system of demand equations of the LinQuad form were estimated for ten meat products using an incomplete system of censored equations. Hispanic households showed a clear preference for beef. Price, income and household size elasticities were estimated for each meat product by ethnic group. The demand for ground beef was the most income inelastic product regardless of ethnicity. Household size had a positive effect on the probability of consuming a particular meat product but a negative effect on actual item expenditures

Introduction

In recent years there has been a dramatic growth in the Hispanic population in the U.S. due to high birth and immigration rates. In 1997, 29.7 million persons of Hispanic origin resided in the United States, representing 11.1% of the total population (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998). According to U.S. Census Bureau projections, by 2010 the Hispanic community is expected to comprise 15.5% of the population. In addition, Hispanics buying power has been growing at a compound rate of 7.5% in the last decade, and today it has been estimated at \$350 billion nationwide. Thus, the Hispanic market is considered as the leading growth market in the United States (Fan and Zuiker, 1998).

Recent studies have shown that Hispanics may exhibit different consumption patterns compared to the rest of the U.S. population. In particular, different life styles and consumption patterns among ethnic groups imply different market potential and opportunities for producers, food processors and retailers. Using the data from the 1987-88 *Nationwide Food Consumption Survey*, Holcomb, Park, and Capps (1995) estimated that on average, U.S. households devoted approximately

15% of their income to total food expenditures, of which 9% was spent on food at home (FAH) and 6% on food away from home (FAFH). However, Fan and Zuiker (1998) found that Hispanic Households allocated significantly more of their budget to FAH, shelter, and apparel and significantly less to FAFH, entertainment, education, health care, and tobacco, compared to non-Hispanic white households.

Comparing different ethnic segments in the U.S. population, Fan and Lewis (1999) suggested that there are statistically significant differences in budget allocations between Hispanic Americans and African Americans. According to their results, Hispanic households allocated a larger proportion of their budget to both FAH and FAFH than African Americans, but less than non-Hispanic Caucasians.

Results obtained by Lanfranco, Ames, and Huang (2001) using a sample from USDA's 1994-96 *Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals* (CSFII 94-96), are consistent with these earlier findings. Hispanics and African-American households committed a higher share of their total budget expenditures to total food, (TF), than non-Hispanic white households, 29.4%, 26.4%, and 18.2%, respectively. Non-Hispanic white households spent comparatively more on FAFH, reflecting high household income, *ceteris paribus*, than other ethnic groups. Furthermore, Lanfranco et al. found that both Hispanics and African-Americans spent almost the same amount of money per adult equivalent on TF, FAH, and FAFH. In contrast, non-Hispanic white households spent a substantially higher amount of money for food per adult equivalent, especially for FAFH.

Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to analyze the demand for meats among various ethnic groups in the United States. Specifically, a system of demand equations for disaggregated meat products was estimated for four ethnic groups of households including Hispanic Americans, African Americans, non-Hispanic whites, and a composite other ethnic minority group.

This study focuses on the demand for meats because they are among the most important components of the American diet. In 1998, average per capita consumption of meats in the United States, measured in carcass weight-equivalent, were 44.6 kg for beef and veal, 31.0 kg for pork, and 47.0 kg for poultry (USDA, 2001). In terms of budget share, red meats and poultry account for more than 28% of total at home food expenditures in 1998. Thus, it is imperative to examine how the demand for meats varies among different ethnic groups in the marketplace and to identify important and influential factors that may account for such observed differences in meat consumption patterns.

Data on U.S. Food Consumption

The data set used in this study was obtained from the *1998 Consumer Expenditure Survey*, CES (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000a). The CES provides detailed expenditure and income information along with various socio-demographic characteristics for each consumer unit included in the survey. The data were aggregated at the household level and only those observations corresponding to households that completed all the information needed for the research were included in the analysis. The total sample contained 4,432 households that were divided into four different ethnic groups: 3,344 households identified as non-Hispanic white (WH), 409 Hispanic (HP) households, 392 African American (AA), and 287 households classified as other ethnic minorities (OM), mainly Asian Americans.

Ten meat products were included in the demand analysis: four types of beef (ground beef, roast, steak, and other beef), four types of pork (bacon, pork chops, ham, and other pork), one poultry product (fresh and frozen chicken) and one type of seafood (canned fish and seafood). The CES only reports expenditure levels. It does not provide prices or physical quantities. Therefore, Consumer Price Index (CPI) information was used to obtain the necessary price variation (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000b). CPI information was available for all the selected meat categories on a monthly basis by region (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West), matching the categorization used by the CES. The physical quantities of meat demanded, measured in pounds consumed per week, were obtained by dividing the corresponding weekly expenditures on each meat product by their imputed price.

The average weekly per capita meat expenditures among ethnic groups and the entire U.S. population are presented in Table 1 for comparison. Adult equivalent units derived from the Amsterdam scale (Deaton and Muellbauer, 1980, p. 193) were used as a measure for the size of the household to express food expenditures on per capita basis. On average, HP households were the largest in size, with 2.79 equivalent adults, followed by OM households with 2.58, AA households with 2.20, and WH households with only 2.08 equivalent adults. Given these differences in household size among ethnic groups, presenting their average expenditures on adult equivalent basis gives a better insight into their consumption behavior.

As shown in Table 1, OM households appear to have the highest weekly expenditure level for meat at \$6.50 per adult equivalent. Of this amount, \$2.03 corresponded to seafood, \$1.61 to beef, \$1.51 to poultry, and \$1.35 to pork, 31%, 25%, 23%, and 21% respectively. Households of AA origin ranked second with a weekly per capita meat expenditure of \$6.24. Unlike the OM households, AA households spent the largest share of their meat expenditures at \$1.86 per week on pork products. HP households ranked third in the amount spent on total meat at \$5.93 per capita, with almost half of that amount on the beef products, or \$2.36 per week. WH households reported the lowest level of average

weekly expenditures on total meat at \$5.23 per capita. Of which \$1.90, \$1.28, \$1.19, and \$0.87 were spent on beef, pork, poultry, and seafood, respectively.

In addition to per capita meat expenditures, a few selected household characteristics are also presented in Table 1. Hispanic households exhibited the largest families and also the youngest ones. The average number of persons in HP households was 3.40, followed by OM households with 2.98, AA households with 2.67, and finally WH households with 2.41. On the other hand, non-Hispanic white families were the smallest in size and oldest in age as compared to the other ethnic groups. The age of the head or reference person of the household averaged 41 years old for the HP group, 46 years old for both AA and OM groups, and 50 years for WH group.

With regard to household income, the OM group had the highest household income which averaged more than \$913 per week. The weekly household income of the WH group was about \$880 followed by HP households with \$623 and AA households with \$581.

The proportion of households below the federal poverty threshold and the proportion of households receiving food stamps are two interesting statistics that further disclose the sample population's socioeconomic characteristics. Almost 26% of both Hispanic and African American households were living below the poverty level and considered to be poor (Table 1). On the other hand, only 11% of non-Hispanic white households and 14% of other minority households were below the 1998 poverty threshold.

Food stamp recipients are generally households with children. Eligible household income is set at 130% of the poverty level (USDA, 2000). Participation in the food stamp program also varies considerably by ethnic group. Hispanic households appeared to be the least likely to benefit from this income transfer program with less than 68% of the poor households receiving food stamps (Table 1). The OM group had the highest participation rate with more than 87% of the households below the

poverty level receiving food stamps in 1998. The proportions of poor households in the AA and WH groups receiving benefits from the food stamp program were about 81% and 74%, respectively.

There are considerable differences among households of different ethnic background with respect to meat expenditures and socioeconomic characteristics. In general, households of Hispanic origin were younger and larger in size than all other household groups. The AA households were the poorest among the four ethnic groups. While the OM group appeared to have the highest average household income, they also were most likely to participate and receive assistance from the food stamp program

The Model Specification

Empirical demand analysis often focuses on only a particular subset of commodities, such as different types of food, or even more specifically, different types of meats. In fact, most of the time the limitations of the data availability obliges researchers to deal with demand systems that are incomplete by nature. However, the proper account of the existing interrelationships among commodities as suggested by the economic theory requires the estimation of a complete demand system.

Unfortunately, the inherent dimensionality problem of complete systems, known as the degrees of freedom problem makes empirical estimation difficult (Bieri and de Janvry, 1972). Many efforts have been made in providing systematic approaches for maintaining and testing separability restrictions hypothesized in the context of full demand systems (Pudney, 1981; Moschini, Moro and Green, 1994; Eales and Unnevehr, 1988; Nayga and Capps, 1994). Although the problem of degrees of freedom can be drastically reduced by aggregating commodities or by assuming some type of additivity or separability among commodities, they imply further and sometimes quite restrictive assumptions about the structure of preferences.

In this study, the incomplete demand systems approach developed by LaFrance and Hanemann (1989) was adopted to derive and specify demand equations for empirical estimation. An attractive feature of the incomplete demand systems is that they permit the specification of demand functions of a

more general form than complete systems allow (LaFrance, 1985; LaFrance and Hanemann, 1989; LaFrance, 1990). The demand functions for the commodities of interest do not necessarily need to have the same functional form as the demands for the other goods, which are included into the composite commodity. Nevertheless, LaFrance (1985; 1986; 1990) investigated integrability conditions of several functional forms commonly utilized to represent directly specified demand functions: linear, constant elasticity, and semi-logarithmic demand models. He found that all of the considered models were quite restrictive in some way, in terms of recovering the structure of preferences within the incomplete demand systems approach.

More recently, Agnew (1998) pointed out that using the so-called LinQuad quasi-expenditure function is the only way to derive demand linear in deflated income and linear and quadratic in deflated prices and consistent with weak integrability. He also showed that the LinQuad admits different general specifications, including a logarithmic version. In a recent application of these models, Agnew (1998) found that both the LinQuad and its generalization met all integrability conditions, a feature not commonly seen in empirical work. Due to these desirable properties, the original LinQuad model was adopted in this study. In its final expression, after imposing symmetry to reduce the number of parameters to be estimated, the demand functions for this model is expressed as:

(1)

$$q_i = \alpha_i + \sum_{j=1}^K \beta_{ij} p_j + \gamma_i \times \left[y - \sum_{j=1}^K \alpha_j p_j - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{jk} p_j p_k \right], \quad i, j, k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Symmetry restriction is given by letting $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}$ (Agnew, 1998). In addition, by deflating all prices and income by a linearly homogeneous concave function of all other prices, the required zero degree homogeneity is obtained. To correct for heteroscedasticity, deflated expenditure was used as

the dependent variable instead of physical quantities (Agnew, 1998), by multiplying both sides of the equation by its corresponding price. Finally, a set of nine demographic and socioeconomic variables was included in the model to investigate the effects of these variables on the demand for meat.

Denoting the l^{th} socioeconomic variable as g_l , and its associate parameter in the i^{th} equation as χ_{il} , the system of demand equations from equation (1) is rewritten as:

$$(2) \quad e_i = p_i \left\{ \alpha_i + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik} p_k + \sum_{l=1}^L \chi_{il} g_l + \gamma_i \left[y - \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k p_k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{jk} p_j p_k - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \chi_{kl} p_k g_l \right] \right\}$$

The Estimation Procedures

Equation (2) is censored when it is estimated using cross-sectional data such as the CES.

Traditionally, the Tobit models have been commonly applied for the estimation of censored equations (Kennedy, 1998). As a single equation approach, an important assumption underlying the Tobit model is that the decision to consume and the decision about the amount to consume are the same. Regarding food consumption, it has been argued that the determinants of the decision whether to consume from a particular food group are often not the same as the determinants of how much to consume, particularly when highly specified food groups are considered (Haines, Guilkey, and Popkin, 1988). In such a case, ignoring the two-step decision process would miss the true behavioral patterns and the estimation results may be incorrect and erroneous.

Models involving a two-stage process imply that two dependent variables are analyzed (Guilkey, Haines, and Popkin, 1990): (a) a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not an individual consumes a particular food item, and (b) the actual quantity consumed for those who chose to consume. Accordingly, the two-stage decision process for consumption of the t^{th} person can be described by the following equations, for $t = 1, \dots, T$:

$$(3) \quad d_t^* = \mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi} + e_t^* \quad \text{Dichotomous or Decision Equation}$$

$$(4) \quad q_t^* = f(\mathbf{w}_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + u_t^* \quad \text{Regression or Level Equation}$$

The dependent variable d_t^* in (3) is a reservation value and it is unobserved. Instead, we observe the binary realization d_t , which takes the value $d_t = 1$ (yes) when $d_t^* > 0$, and $d_t = 0$ (no) when $d_t^* \leq 0$. The dependent variable in (4) contains the consumption information of those individuals for which $d_t = 1$ (yes), that is $q_t = q_t^*$ when $d_t^* > 0$, otherwise their information is unobservable ($q_t = 0$). The vectors \mathbf{v}_t and \mathbf{w}_t represent the regressors included in the decision and level equation, respectively, which may or may not contain variables in common, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ are their associate parameters. The term $f(\mathbf{w}_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a general deterministic component that can be nonlinear in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. If $\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{w}_t$ and the residuals in (3) and (4) have a singular normal density ($e_t^* \equiv u_t^*$), then $\boldsymbol{\theta} \equiv \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and the standard Tobit model emerges (Heckman, 1979, p. 155).

Under the hypothesis of selectivity bias, the disturbances, e_t^* and u_t^* , are assumed to be correlated through a correlation coefficient ρ (rho), and following a bivariate normal distribution. Some alternatives to deal with this problem include the estimation of each individual equation using the Heckman's two-step procedure (Heckman, 1976; 1979) and the Amemiya's type II Tobit method (Amemiya, 1985), two "sample selection" models derived from the original Tobit.

This study uses the two-step procedure proposed by Shonkwiler and Yen (1999) instead of a direct maximum likelihood estimation, which is cumbersome to implement due to complexities of the functional form chosen, or the size of the system. Following Maddala (1983), if for each of the K equations in (4), instead of using only the nonzero observations we use all the observations, the unconditional mean of q_t is:

(5)

$$\begin{aligned} E(q_t) &= \Pr(d_t^* > 0) \times E(q_t | d_t^* > 0) + \Pr(d_t^* \leq 0) \times E(q_t | d_t^* \leq 0) \\ &= \Phi_t(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \times \left[f(\mathbf{w}_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \delta \frac{\phi_t(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi})}{\Phi_t(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi})} \right] + [1 - \Phi_t(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi})] \times 0 \\ &= \Phi_t(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \times f(\mathbf{w}_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \delta \phi_t(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \quad , \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \end{aligned}$$

The term $\phi(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi})$ is the standard normal probability density function (pdf) of the probit equation, the term $\Phi(\mathbf{v}_t' \boldsymbol{\varphi})$ is the cumulative density function (cdf), and δ is an additional parameter to be estimated. Adding an error term, if the system has K equations (commodities) and T observations (individuals), equation (4) can be written as,

(6)

$$q_{tk} = \Phi(\mathbf{v}_{tk}' \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k) \times f(\mathbf{w}_{tk}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k) + \delta_k \phi(\mathbf{v}_{tk}' \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k) + \varepsilon_{tk} \quad t = 1, \dots, T; k = 1, \dots, K.$$

The final expression used for estimation is obtained by substituting the general term $f(\mathbf{w}_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ by the LinQuad demand function of equation (2). Given that the censoring is governed by separate stochastic processes, the model is not invariant to the choice of what equation is dropped to avoid singularity of the variance-covariance matrix when restrictions such as adding-up are imposed. In the case of incomplete demand systems, the natural choice is to discard the demand equation for the composite commodity (LaFrance and Hanemann, 1989).

The estimation of the system is carried out in a two-step procedure using all the observations. In the first step, equation (3) is estimated for each food item by maximum likelihood (MLE) probit procedure to obtain the consistent parameter estimates for $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_k$. The estimated values of $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ are then used to compute

ϕ and Φ , so that in the second step, the system equations can be jointly estimated by MLE or SUR to obtain consistent estimates for the θ_k and δ_k parameters.

Results and Discussion

For the sake of brevity, the results of parameter estimates obtained from the two-step estimation procedure will not be presented. In general, the results were satisfactory. In the first step estimation, the estimated income coefficients all had a positive sign, except in a few cases (other pork for HP and AA, and ground beef and pork chop for OM) where the signs were negative and not significantly different from zero. The household size coefficients were estimated with more statistical precision than the coefficients representing the level of income, regardless of the ethnic origin. For all ethnic groups and meat items, the coefficients associated with the household size variable were positive. Most of them were significantly different from zero at the 10% significance level. In general, the largest magnitudes corresponded to ground beef and chicken, except for the OM group that reported the largest magnitudes for chicken and other pork..

The number of significant coefficients varied among ethnic groups. As expected, the larger the size of the sample, the higher the number of statistically significant estimated parameters in a regression, *ceteris paribus*. In fact, for the WH group, the associated coefficient of household size was statistically significant at the 1% for all the individual meat items. For HP households, the second largest group in number of households, all the estimated coefficients for this variable were statistically different from zero at 1% significance level, except bacon and canned fish. The estimated parameter for canned fish was not different from zero at any predetermined significance level for both AA and OM groups. For households of AA origin, the household size coefficient for roast was found to be significant only at the 10% significance level while the coefficient of pork chops was significant at 5% level. For OM households, this parameter was also significant at 5% for other beef. For all the other

meat items, the associated household size coefficients were statistically different from zero at the 1% significance level.

In sum, the results of the probit estimations from the first step show that both income and household size are important factors affecting meat purchase decisions. However, the size of the household appeared to be more influential in the household's decision to spend on specific meat items than the level of income. In particular, both ground beef and chicken were by far the most responsive meat categories to changes in household size regardless of ethnic origin. The results suggest that as household size increases the probability of purchasing ground beef and chicken increases by 8% for HP households. The corresponding changes in the probability to purchase ground beef and chicken were, respectively, 11% and 8% for WH households, 12% for both products for AA group, and 8% and 13% for OM group.

With respect to the second step estimation results, income and household size elasticities, along with their corresponding confidence intervals at the 90% level are reported in Table 2. The magnitudes of the income elasticities were less than one in absolute value for all ethnic groups suggesting that no meat item was regarded as a luxury good. The results show that WH households were, in general, the least responsive to changes in total income. The result may be attributed to the fact that WH households had relatively higher income as compared to the HP and AA groups. For WH households, the results indicate that only two meat items, roast and pork chops had income elasticities greater than 0.10. On the other hand, the demand for meat in the OM group was found to be most responsive to changes in household income, with six out of ten meat items exhibiting income elasticity greater than 0.10, ranging from 0.11 for chicken to 0.54 for other beef.

The demand for ground beef was most income inelastic among meat products regardless of ethnicity. The estimated income elasticities were 0.03 for HP households, 0.04 for WH households, 0.07 for AA households, and 0.05 for OM households. Furthermore, the estimated income elasticities

for ground beef are similar in magnitudes among different ethnic groups. On the other hand, the magnitude of the income elasticity for roast was always greater than 0.10, ranging from 0.12 for WH households to 0.29 for OM households. This is to be expected because roast is a high-quality cut as compared to ground beef. Therefore, more roast would be purchased relative to ground beef as household income rises, *ceteris paribus*.

For other meat products, greater differences were found among households of different ethnic backgrounds. For instance, AA households showed the largest income elasticity of 0.36 for canned fish, while the corresponding income elasticity was only about 0.11 for HP households. For other beef, the estimated income elasticity varies from 0.07 for HP group to as high as 0.54 for OM group. Similarly, income elasticities for bacon vary from 0.09 for WH households to 0.14 for AA households and 0.16 for HP households. Income elasticity for ham was found to be highly inelastic for WH households (0.06). These differences tend to support the hypothesis that demand for meat products may be quite different among ethnic groups due to specific tastes and preferences associated with ethnicity.

It should be noted that there are several negative income elasticities shown in Table 2, suggesting that some meat items may be considered as inferior goods for some ethnic groups. This includes pork chops for HP, AA, and OM households and other beef, other pork products, and chicken for WH and AA households. Canned fish may also be an inferior good for WH and OM households, as well as bacon for households of the OM group. Most surprising was the case of steak, which appeared to be an inferior good for AA households with an estimated income elasticity of -0.19.

The estimated household size elasticities exhibited negative signs in most of the cases, with magnitudes even greater than one in absolute value. Although the probability of consuming meat products increases with the size of the household, it seems that once the decision to consume is made, household size has a negative effect on the level of consumption. Nevertheless, important differences

in the responsiveness to changes in household size can be observed among groups. In fact, only roast and ham had a negative household size elasticity for all four ethnic groups. On the other hand, the household size elasticities for canned fish were positive for WH, HP, and OM households ranging from 0.10 to 0.36. Similarly, positive household size elasticities were observed for HP (other beef and pork chops), WH (steak, other beef and chicken), AA (steak), and OM households (bacon). In the case of other pork, the household size elasticity was positive and greater than one for HP and AA households, as well as ground beef for OM group.

Conclusions

The focus of this study was to provide an insight into demand patterns of the Hispanic households for specific food categories in comparison with other ethnic groups. To this end, a system of equations of the LinQuad form for ten disaggregated meat products was estimated using a two-step estimation procedure for a system of censored equations. Four different groups of households, namely, Hispanic American, African American, non-Hispanic whites, and other ethnic minority were included in the analysis. Although a vast array of information was generated, only results pertaining to household income and size were presented because they are the most important socioeconomic characteristics that may affect meat demand.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this study. Hispanic households appeared to have different food consumption patterns as compared to other ethnic groups in the United States. Specifically, Hispanic households showed a clear preference and fondness for beef over other meat products. They spent more of their food expenditures on each beef item than any other ethnic groups, especially on steak and ground beef.

The effect of changes in household income on the probability of spending on steak was found to be important for all groups. This is expected since steak was considered a luxury meat in this study. The results also showed that the size of the household also had a positive effect on the probability of

consuming a particular meat product. However, once a household chose to consume, household size had a negative effect on the amount of money spent on that item, especially among the higher priced meats. This may have important implications for retailers, in terms of presentation and convenience of meat products. Offering products especially designed for large households, such as family packs and special cuts, may not only take advantage of their higher probability relative to small households of purchasing the product, but also lead them to buy a larger quantity.

The demand for ground beef and chicken appeared to be least responsive to changes in household income. Not surprisingly, the most responsive meat item with respect to changes in household income was roast. Only other beef for OM group and canned fish for AA group showed an estimated income elasticity greater than 0.35.

The information presented in this study may be used to complement previous consumer demand research, providing useful insights about the meat consumption patterns of the growing Hispanic community in the U.S., and the role of socioeconomic factors in the demand for meats in the U.S. Additionally, the comparison with other ethnic groups contributed to a broader understanding of the demand for meats within the context of the changing demographic composition of the U.S. population. As Hispanic households constitute a larger share of the U.S. population, their presence will impact the demand for meat products, especially beef.

References

- Agnew, G.K. "LinQuad: An Incomplete Demand System Approach to Demand Estimation and Exact Welfare Measures." M.S. Thesis. Dept. of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Arizona, 1998.
- Amemiya, T. *Advanced Econometrics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Bieri, J. and A. de Janvry. *Empirical Analysis of Demand under Consumer Budgeting*. Giannini Foundation Monograph, No. 30, 1972.
- Deaton, A. and J. Muellbauer. *Economics and Consumer Behavior*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Eales, J.S. and L.J. Unnevehr. "Demand for Beef and Chicken Products: Separability and Structural Change." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 70(August 1988):521-32.
- Fan, J.X. and J.K. Lewis. "Budget Allocation Patterns of African Americans." *J. Cons. Affairs* 33(1), 1999:134-164.
- Fan, J.X. and V.S. Zuiker. "A Comparison of Household Budget Allocation Patterns between Hispanic Americans and Non-Hispanic White Americans." *J. Family and Econ. Issues* 19(2), 1998:151-174.
- Guilkey, D.K., P.S. Haines, and B.M. Popkin. "The Distribution of Food Consumption over a Year: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 72(November 1990):891-900.
- Haines, P.S., D.K. Guilkey, and B.M. Popkin. "Modeling Food Consumption Decisions as a Two-Step Process." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 70(August 1988):543-52.
- Heckman, J.J. "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error." *Econometrica* 47(1979):153-62.
- Heckman, J.J. "The Common Structure of Statistical Models of Truncation, Sample Selection, and Limited Dependent Variables and a Simple Estimation for Such Models." *Ann. Econ. and Soc. Meas.* 5(1976):475-592.
- Holcomb, R.B., J.L. Park, and O. Capps, Jr. "Revisiting Engel's law: Examining Expenditure Patterns for Food at Home and Away from Home." *J. Food Distrib. Res.* (September 1995):1-8.
- Kennedy, P. *A Guide to Econometrics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1998.
- LaFrance, J.T. "Incomplete Demand Systems and Semilogarithmic Demand Models." *Austr. J. Agr. Econ.* 34(August 1990):118-31.
- LaFrance, J.T. "The Structure of Constant Elasticity Demand Models." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 68(August 1986):543-52.
- LaFrance, J.T. "Linear Demand Functions in Theory and Practice." *J. Econ. Theory* 37(October 1985):147-66.
- LaFrance, J.T. and M.W. Hanemann. "The Dual Structure of Incomplete Demand Systems." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 68(August 1989):543-52.
- Lanfranco, B.A., G.C.W. Ames, and C.L. Huang. "A Censored System Estimation of Hispanic Households Food Consumption Patterns." Dept. of Agr. & Applied Econ., FS-01-01. College of Agr. & Envir. Sciences, University of Georgia. Athens, GA: Faculty Series, January 2001.
- Maddala, G.S. *Limited Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Moschini, G., D. Moro, and R.D. Green. "Maintaining and Testing Separability in Demand Systems." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 76(February 1994):61-73.
- Nayga, R.M. and O. Capps, Jr. "Test of Weak Separability in Disaggregated Meat Products." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 76(November 1994):800-08.

- Pudney, S. "An Empirical Method of Approximating the Separable Structure of Consumer Preferences." *Rev. Econ. Stud.* 48(1981):561-77.
- Shonkwiler, J.S. and S.T. Yen. "Two-Step Estimation of a Censored System of Equations." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 81(November 1999):972-82.
- U.S. Census Bureau. *Current Population Report*. Washington, D.C., 1998.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. "Food Stamps: About FSP – Introduction." *Food Nutrition Service*.
URL: <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/MENU/about/about.htm>, Last modified: March 28, 2000.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. "FAS Online."
URL: <http://www.fas.usda.gov/dlp/circular/2001/01-03lp/livestock.htm>, Last modified: March 21, 2001.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. "1998 Consumer Expenditure Diary Survey." *Consumer Expenditure Survey*. CD-ROM. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Washington, D.C., 2000a.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Consumer Price Indexes Home Page."
URL: <http://www.bls.gov/cpihome.htm>, Last modified: December 15, 2000b.

Table 1. Average Weekly Per Capita Meat Expenditures and Household Socio-Economic Characteristics by Ethnic Group, CES, 1998

Expenditure Categories	Hispanic (HP)	Non-Hispanic White (WH)	African American (AA)	Other Minority (OM)	All Households
Total Meat expenditures	5.93	5.23	6.24	6.50	5.47
Total Beef	2.36	1.90	1.60	1.61	1.89
Ground Beef	0.76	0.67	0.66	0.52	0.67
Roast	0.32	0.35	0.30	0.31	0.34
Steak	1.00	0.72	0.48	0.57	0.72
Other Beef	0.23	0.15	0.16	0.21	0.16
Total Pork	1.52	1.28	1.86	1.35	1.36
Bacon	0.21	0.21	0.27	0.18	0.22
Pork Chops	0.39	0.25	0.42	0.25	0.28
Ham	0.33	0.34	0.32	0.27	0.33
Other Pork	0.37	0.26	0.53	0.47	0.31
Total Poultry	1.26	1.19	1.58	1.51	1.25
Chicken	1.05	0.89	1.18	1.18	0.95
Total Seafood	0.82	0.87	1.20	2.03	0.97
Canned Fish	0.13	0.18	0.11	0.21	0.17
Household size (persons)	3.40	2.41	2.67	2.98	2.56
Household size, in adult equivalents	2.79	2.08	2.20	2.58	2.19
Age of household head	40.8	49.5	45.5	46.2	48.13
Household income (\$/week)	623.00	879.75	581.07	913.62	831.83
% of household below the poverty level ^a	25.9	11.2	25.8	13.9	14.02
% of poor households receiving food stamps	67.9	73.6	81.2	87.5	74.65
Number of Households	409	3,344	392	287	4,432

Note: All expenditures are reported in \$/week, per adult equivalent.

^aThe poverty level in 1998 was \$16,530 per year for a family of four, including two children.

Table 2. Estimated Income and Household Size Elasticities for Meats and 90% Confidence Intervals by Ethnic Groups, CES, 1998

Meat Products	Hispanic (HP)		Non-Hispanic White (WH)		African American (AA)		Other Minority (OM)	
	Income.	Household Size	Income	Household Size	Income	Household Size	Income.	Household Size
Ground Beef	.0332 (- .0555 ~ .1219)	- 1.5910 (- 2.5739 ~ -.6081)	.0436 (- .0156 ~ .1029)	- 1.0976 (- 1.5605 ~ -.6347)	.0739 (- .1322 ~ .2800)	- 1.0462 (- 2.0449 ~ -.0476)	.0512 (- .2079 ~ .3102)	1.3452 (- 2.0355 ~ 4.7259)
Roast	.1713 (- .0252 ~ .3678)	- 1.7852 (- 3.8476 ~ .2772)	.1190 (- .0259 ~ .2639)	- 1.7759 (- 2.9161 ~ -.6357)	.2349 (- .0618 ~ .5316)	- .9405 (- 1.7970 ~ -.0840)	.2948 (- .0391 ~ .6286)	- 3.9276 (- 8.8393 ~ .9841)
Steak	.0939 (- .0177 ~ .2056)	- .7813 (- 1.5677 ~ .0051)	.0437 (- .0761 ~ .1635)	.0375 (- .4448 ~ .5198)	- .1892 (- .5489 ~ .1704)	.1174 (- .8040 ~ 1.0388)	.2221 (- .1055 ~ .5496)	- .8544 (- 2.7240 ~ 1.0153)
Other Beef	.0671 (- .0639 ~ .1981)	.7612 (- .5245 ~ 2.0449)	- .2642 (- .7622 ~ .2339)	.3382 (- 1.2221 ~ 1.8984)	- .0649 (- .6949 ~ .5652)	- .5103 (-20.3411 ~ 17.5247)	.5435 (.1454 ~ .9415)	- .6731 (- 3.0099 ~ 1.6637)
Bacon	.1561 (.0147 ~ .2975)	- 1.0440 (- 1.9350 ~ -.1530)	.0927 (- .0020 ~ .1875)	- 2.2370 (- 3.1633 ~ - 1.3108)	.1424 (- .1412 ~ .4260)	- .8235 (- 2.3869 ~ .7380)	- .0030 (- .4641 ~ .4582)	.9304 (- 1.9998 ~ 3.8606)
Pork Chops	- .1270 (- .3249 ~ .0709)	.5379 (- .9189 ~ 1.9948)	.1072 (.0018 ~ .2126)	- .8745 (- 1.4766 ~ -.2724)	- .0039 (- .3286 ~ .3207)	- 8.2003 (- 15.8877 ~ -.5128)	- .0826 (- .4449 ~ .2797)	- 5.7761 (- 15.7750 ~ 4.2228)
Ham	.1632 (.0581 ~ .2683)	- .9458 (- 1.7752 ~ -.1164)	.0619 (- .0800 ~ .2037)	- 1.7561 (- 2.7592 ~ -.7530)	- .0614 (- .3375 ~ .2147)	- 1.1695 (- 3.8035 ~ 1.4645)	.2802 (- .0396 ~ .5999)	- .9360 (- 3.4780 ~ 1.6060)
Other Pork	.1609 (- .0095 ~ .3312)	1.2933 (.0794 ~ 2.5072)	- .0917 (- .4002 ~ .2169)	- .1360 (- 1.2089 ~ .9369)	- .0089 (- .2980 ~ .2803)	1.6329 (- .3190 ~ 3.5848)	.3217 (- .0654 ~ .7089)	- 2.2310 (- 6.0597 ~ 1.5978)
Chicken	.0390 (- .1185 ~ .1964)	- 1.6602 (- 3.0016 ~ -.3187)	- .0259 (- .1620 ~ .1101)	.4386 (- .9156 ~ 1.7927)	- .1285 (- .3302 ~ .0732)	- .4184 (- 1.3465 ~ .5096)	.1109 (- .0191 ~ .2409)	- .5102 (- 1.6166 ~ .5962)
Canned Fish	.1070 (- .0568 ~ .2709)	.2607 (- .4891 ~ 1.0106)	- .0981 (- .2616 ~ .0655)	.1041 (- .8192 ~ 1.0274)	.3642 (- .0156 ~ .7439)	- .5145 (- 1.2789 ~ .2500)	- .3314 (- .7983 ~ .1356)	.3612 (- 1.2495 ~ 1.9719)

Note: Numbers in parenthesis represent lower and upper bounds of confidence intervals of the elasticity estimates, respectively, at the 90% level of confidence