



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.*

Swine

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING
UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

cracklean an experiment in branding pork

D. R. HUGHES, D. LESSER & D. RENARD

WITHDRAWN
GIANNINI FOUNDATION OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
LIBRARY

SEP 10 1974

1974

£100

REPORT **18**

58

CRACKLEAN
AN EXPERIMENT IN BRANDING PORK

D. R. Hughes, D. Lesser and D. Renard

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE
Department of Agricultural Marketing

Report No. 18

1974

£1.00

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to record their thanks for help and cooperation in the research to Stewart Campbell and his colleagues at BOCM/Silcock Ltd., and to the regional shop and office staffs of Dewhurst Ltd.

David Hughes, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

David Lesser, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Diana Renard, J. Walter Thompson, London.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Summary and Conclusions	7
Background and Rationale	9
Research Objectives	11
Methodology	15
The Promotion Campaign	19
Qualitative Research	23
Sales Tests	27
The Consumer Survey	31
Marketing and Research Implications	37
Tables 1-38	39
Appendices A-C	55

FOREWORD

Fresh meat is almost entirely sold to the consumer on a commodity basis. Thus he is guided in making his choice between possible different offerings of quality, either by his own judgement or that of his supplier. There is considerable evidence that the majority of consumers are not sufficiently knowledgeable about the quality characteristics of meat which can be assessed visually to make a rational choice. Though butchers may choose well for them, there would be obvious advantages for consumers if they were able to make rational choices independently. This has led many to consider the possibilities of branding operations with fresh meat. Indeed, there have been some commercial experiments of this kind. For the most part, however, these do not appear to have been conspicuously successful. Whether this is because of heavy costs involved in a branded marketing operation of a product the quality of which is as difficult to control as that of meat, or because the branding concept does not meet with consumer acceptance does not seem to be clear.

This report deals with an experiment which was sponsored by BOCM/Silcock to test the possibilities of branding fresh pork under their name 'Cracklean'. While it cannot pretend to answer conclusively all the questions which could be raised with regard to the possibilities of a branding operation for fresh meat it, nevertheless, should provide information of considerable interest to any organisation contemplating selling fresh meat under a brand name.

E. M. Carpenter

Department of Agricultural
Marketing

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Cracklean experiment represents a trial by BOCM/Silcock of the possibilities of branding fresh meat. Cracklean is branded pork of high and controlled quality. A small-scale test in Cardiff suggested that the concept was viable.

Dewhursts Limited co-operated with BOCM/Silcock in a test marketing operation in Northern England in November 1972. Group discussions showed that associations with the word Cracklean made it a suitable and positive name for pork, and an advertising campaign was prepared by Wasey Quadrant (Dewhurst's advertising agency). The campaign was complemented by a three-part public relations programme, aimed at pig-producers, Dewhurst's shop managers and housewives respectively. The campaign lasted four weeks; over the whole area the total expenditure was under £10,000.

The effects of the campaign were measured through a sales comparison and through a survey of housewives' opinions. Although the campaign was short and not intense the sales figures showed some movement towards pork during and after the campaign. The opinion survey reflected strong support for the idea of branded meat and confirmed the suitability of Cracklean as a brand name.

Further research is indicated on pricing, attitudes in the meat trade, and the mechanics of branding. A marketing operation has to be properly merchandised, and should justify a price premium.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

BOCM/Silcock manufacture and market animal feeds. Their Pig Marketing Services Division has the function of stimulating pig feed sales by helping the pig farmer to gain better and more consistent returns than he could otherwise obtain. The Division performs this function in three specific ways. It conducts a programme of pig improvement and makes available to the farmer only selected stock. It offers the farmer advice and help in moving the weaners through to pork pigs as efficiently as possible. And by seeking ways of raising the profitability of the processors to whom their farmers sell, Pig Marketing Services aims at attracting premium prices for those farmers.

The processor's profitability is closely conditioned by the pigs he buys and his method of procurement, as well as by his ability to sell his production to advantage in a competitive market. Pig Marketing Services would, therefore, define their role in relation to these two factors as firstly supplying the required numbers of pigs that consistently meet the processor's specification, and secondly making available marketing expertise which would enable him to increase his market share and thereby increase his profits. This, of course, is calculated to increase farmer profitability and thus to increase sales of pig feed to the farmer.

One of the strategies by which marketing skills could be brought to bear upon pork is the introduction of a branded pork. For most products branding and promotion can not only greatly enlarge the market but in some cases may actually be said to create it. The argument that meat might be unsuitable for branding must rest on the assumption that meat is not a product for which a particular specification could be established and maintained within narrow enough limits. Or else, if the specification could be met accurately, then, the argument would run, there is ample evidence that everyone wants lean tender meat and knows it when she sees it, so that branding would be superfluous if not misleading, and the only way of gaining a marketing advantage is by increasing the efficiency of production or distribution. This might well be the case; indeed common sense and economic analysis suggest that for some standard commodities, like salt, it should be the case. Yet even for salt branding has proved a highly effective marketing instrument. And there is some direct evidence to suggest that meat could be successfully branded and promoted: consider the premium attracted by 'Scotch' beef, a product not always clearly distinguishable except by the label, and sometimes not

even precisely defined. There is, therefore, on the face of it, reason to believe that the introduction of a branded pork could be an effective strategy. This strategy was favoured and 'Cracklean' was the name adopted for the product. Cracklean pork is pork offered as a consistent, branded consumer product. This report is on the development of the product concept and, principally, on the brief test market in Northern England.

A small pilot marketing scheme was carried out in the South Wales area in 1969. 'Cracklean Pork' was promoted (through local press, advertisements on the sides of buses, and butchers' displays) as pork that was 'lean and succulent with tasty crackling' and as 'the best of Home-Produced Pork'. The results of the experiment were not objectively evaluated but the sales indications were that a thorough test market was warranted to determine whether or not the branded pork concept was a viable proposition.

The test was planned in conjunction with Dewhursts and British Beef Company, both subsidiaries of Union International. These companies were chosen for specific reasons: Pig Marketing Services supplied pigs to the British Beef Company in a large enough quantity to support a promotion of the size envisaged; Dewhursts were sufficiently well organised to control efficiently the campaign at shop level, and they could supply accurate sales figures on which the campaign would be evaluated. Also the branding of meat was an exercise that they considered would be important in future meat retailing operations and they were therefore interested in becoming involved.

To provide information on which future promotions could be based, BOCM/Silcock had earlier sought from the Department of Agricultural Marketing at Newcastle University an analysis of the UK market for pork. (A summary of the parts of that analysis on attitudes to pork, and of related later work forms Appendix A of this publication). Now BOCM/Silcock invited the University Department and Wasey Quadrant Ltd., (Dewhurst's Advertising Agency) to discuss the research framework and formulate the campaign required for a successful test market project.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The Cracklean campaign had three objectives. One related to the supply of pork to Silcocks, and a second to the company's services to producers, processors and retailers. The third objective related to the reaction of consumers to the Cracklean concept, and it is with this objective alone that the research was concerned.

In the consumer market, the campaign was a test marketing operation though at a low strength of promotion. Three questions were set:

1. Would consumers accept the idea of branded meat?
2. What would be the effect of promotion on normal meat buying habits?
3. Would consumers pay extra for higher quality meat that was promoted?

The answers to these questions must tend to overlap. A usable answer to the first question would be a simple count of consumers who would reject branding as a gimmick, against those who would welcome it as an aid in their more accurate buying. Better though would be an answer that measured the strength of individual acceptance or rejection; and one reliable and very pertinent measure is the premium housewives would be willing to pay for branded meat - the substance of the third question. Some price premium is probably necessary, to cover the extra costs of the branding and promotion. It is possible though that the strategy could prove profitable even if housewives would not pay more for Cracklean, provided that at the standard price they bought sufficiently more of it. Question two, on the effect of promotion on normal meat buying habits, covered this possibility.

All research poses problems of validity. In this instance the main such problem was whether the questions set could be answered by a promotion of the sort envisaged, whatever measurements were made of the results. It is, of course, never possible to know that some alternative campaign would not have been more successful but some of the uncertainties can be reduced by the research.

One such was the branding tactic adopted. Alternative tactics are to impose upon a product an actual registered name such as 'Cracklean', or to attach to it a favourable association

through, say, labelling it with the county of origin or the guarantee of the retailer. The principle is the same, the principle of removing the buying reason from the observed attributes of the product and of offering some further associations or warrant of quality; but the two methods are different degrees of the same process, and adopting a brand name is the more extreme form, moving the emphasis from product to brand. Is name-branding the right choice for a meat?

Then, is 'Cracklean' the best name, or even a good name? Although the name Cracklean had been used in the Cardiff campaign and had there drawn no unfavourable comment, and although it seemed to everyone a relevant and evocative brand name, it had not been objectively or formally tested on any scale at all. A further question is whether the media used were effective media for promoting meat.

There were however more intractable problems arising from the nature of the research questions.

Strictly all three questions are about meat generically whereas the Cracklean experiment is only with pork. But of course the answers for pork are important enough in their own right and they can reasonably be accepted as some guide as to what would happen with any meat. The questions though are about the profit possibilities for branded pork over a period of several years, when the public had got used to the idea. What relevant answers could be provided by a promotion lasting a few weeks? Furthermore, if it were decided to launch the product, the media used and the level of expenditure would be different from what was proposed for this test promotion.

Therefore the best the research could achieve, and what it must aim at was finding indicators that could reasonably be related to a full-scale prolonged marketing endeavour. Directly of course it could only measure the effects of the actual campaign conducted; the rest must rely on deduction.

Thus directly the research questions resolve into:
Before the campaign opened:

1. What are the associations of Cracklean and what was conveyed by the proposed advertising material?

During and after the campaign:

2. Was the campaign noticed? How, where, and by whom?
3. What effect did it have,

- a) on buying
 - b) in building attitudes to Cracklean?
4. Given some little exposure to a branded meat was the public reaction favourable or unfavourable?

METHODOLOGY

Four research techniques were proposed:

A product perception test in which Cracklean pork and other pork were compared, first in a blind test and then labelled to assess what differences in perception were generated by the name.

Qualitative consumer research, using housewife group discussions in which associations to the name Cracklean would be evoked and reactions probed, and the advertising material and the concept of branded pork would be explored.

Quantitative consumer research to measure consumer awareness of the campaign and, later, consumer attitudes to Cracklean pork through consumer surveys.

Analysis of sales figures under different test conditions, before, during and after the campaign.

The product perception test was rejected as unduly elaborate. The methodology for the rest of the research is discussed below.

Qualitative Research

Two group discussions were arranged with housewives, one group in Sunderland, the other in Leeds. The housewives were drawn from households classified as C1 or C2 (clerical and skilled worker occupational groups); their ages ranged from 25 to 45 years, and each of them had bought pork within the previous two months. To start with, the housewives were given 30 seconds to write down the words they associated with pork and then 30 seconds for Cracklean pork. Then they discussed their beliefs about what Cracklean pork implied. The concept of branding was explored in detail including quality expectations, whether it would be packaged, price premiums and relevant cuts. Finally they were shown the proposed advertising material, which had been prepared in layout form, and their reactions were probed.

The promotional material shown was a window bill, a poster, a banner and newspaper advertisement. An Edwardian or country theme was used for the lettering and illustrations (see Appendix C). This theme had been successful in an earlier Dewhurst promotion..

Sales Tests

The test was originally intended to investigate both whether Cracklean could fetch a price premium and whether the campaign would increase sales of the promoted Cracklean against sales of other pork. The price premium was not tested. Administrative difficulties of recording sales of two sorts of pork in the same shop through the standard methods of Dewhurst's accounting prevented a within-shop price test being conducted. The alternative was a set of matched shops or areas selling Cracklean at the higher and the lower prices. This too was considered likely to interfere too much with Dewhurst's trading flexibility; besides which to match accurately would have been problematic and therefore to eliminate statistical confounding would have required larger samples of shops than the scale of the campaign would allow. In the event it was reluctantly decided that Cracklean would be sold at the standard price everywhere.

Thus the only sales measure was of sales increases brought about by the Cracklean promotion. To measure this effect, sales records in two towns in the test area were to be compared with concurrent sales records in the two matched towns outside the area, for the six weeks before the promotion, for the four-week promotion period and for three weeks immediately after (until the time ran into the Christmas buying period). The figures recorded were the sales for each shop for each week of pork, beef, lamb and chicken, by weight and by value. What was to be compared were the sales in test areas against sales in control areas before, during and after the promotion. The criterion of success was a statistically significant difference between promotion and control figures.

The two test areas selected were centred on Sunderland and Leeds respectively. There were no rigorous selection criteria. Each area contained a concentration of Dewhurst shops, which could be supplied with Cracklean pork, the sales figures could be conveniently monitored, and the consumer research could be conducted relatively economically. Coventry and Nottingham were chosen as control towns, approximately matched with the test towns in the numbers and distribution of the Dewhurst shops.

Consumer Survey

Two surveys were planned. One, the 'immediate awareness' survey was to be by personal interview on the pavement, in the last week of the campaign. The second was to be by personal

interview in the home at the end of the six-week period following the promotion: during this six weeks, Cracklean was to be on offer in Dewhurst shops and promoted in the shop but without other advertising support. The first analysis of the immediate impact survey suggested that little more information could be gained from a further survey, and therefore the in-home interviews were cancelled. Thus the term consumer survey in this report refers to the immediate awareness pavement survey only.

The questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix B to this report.

It was estimated that the six days' work by four interviewers would produce 960 interviews, 480 in each area. Later the plan was changed to bring in a proportion of non-Dewhurst shops: a third interviewer was added in Sunderland where there were more Dewhurst shops spread over a wider area. The intention was that the interviews should be conducted on the pavement, the interviewees being people who had just left the shop. The pilot run showed that in bad weather (and a severe week was forecast) pavement interviews were difficult, even impossible. Therefore the interviewers were instructed that if necessary, but only if necessary, they might, with the manager's permission, interview inside the Dewhurst shops.

In the event the survey yielded 1,182 usable questionnaires. Seven hundred and forty-four (63%) were in the Sunderland area, four hundred and thirty-eight were in the Leeds area (Table 28). Eight hundred and seventy-six (74%) were with Dewhurst shoppers and three hundred and six (26%) with people coming out of other butchers' shops. One in three of the Dewhurst interviews was conducted inside the shop. Almost all the interviewees were women, but there were a few men (more than one of whom appeared startled to be asked by a woman, 'What does the word Cracklean make you think of?'). By estimated age the sample was distributed as 45% in the 31-50 age range, 31% at 30 or under and 22% over 50.

THE PROMOTION CAMPAIGN

Three major campaign objectives were identified. The most basic was to measure more precisely the validity of the Cracklean approach to pig marketing, in terms of consumer acceptance of branded meat, of the effect of promotion on normal meat buying habits, and of consumer willingness to pay premiums for promoted superior quality meat. The second was to reaffirm to producers, processors and retailers the full commitment that BOCM Silcock wished to make to the pig industry in the UK, extending from the production of pigs through to purchase by the final consumer. The third to demonstrate, particularly to pig producers, that BOCM/Silcock were concerned with improving producers' returns. The campaign was two-pronged; a series of public relations exercises aimed at producers, the meat trade and consumers; and a consumer advertising campaign.

Public Relations

The Cracklean public relations campaigns were aimed at three separate audiences, the producer, retailer and the consumer. However the campaign messages were not entirely specific to each audience as cross-fertilisation of information was both inevitable and desirable, i.e. producers and producers' wives would be exposed to the consumer press, and the consumer would perhaps read the agricultural articles or see relevant farming programmes on the TV.

The public relations campaign had three main objects: through editorial discussion in the consumer press, to promote to pig producers in the North East of England and Yorkshire the latest development in integrated pig production; to encourage a favourable qualitative judgement on the pork produced on the special Silcock's feed; and to present Dewhursts as the retail chain eager to offer customers a tested 'better buy' and good value. At luncheons in Tyneside and York, housewives, journalists and a panel of specialists were invited to inspect, taste and critically assess 'Cracklean' pork. Before lunch the audience was told of the extent of BOCM's involvement in the meat producing process, the justification for the proposed increased involvement was explained, housewives were shown how to choose pork cuts, and the advantages of controlled growth pork in family and catering cooking were illustrated. In addition the local newspapers, radio and television press were offered a 'list' of relevant stories, recipes and photographs.

The retailer campaign was thought necessary to remind the butcher that 'Cracklean' pork was more desirable than ordinary

pork, thus to stimulate his interest in the meat and increase sales. On the one hand, the butcher was informed of the advantages that the meat had to offer to the consumer. On the other, prizes were offered to the Branch Managers in each area for high sales of Cracklean pork as a percentage of his total turnover for the promotional period. The prize for the highest sales was a weekend in Paris for two, all expenses paid, and there were 20 bottles of champagne given as consolation prizes for the runners-up.

The pig producer campaign was centred on a Pig Marketing Conference at Askham Bryan College of Agriculture. The conference had four main aims: to persuade more leading pig producers to join BOCM/Silcock Pig Marketing Scheme and buy more BOCM/Silcock products, by demonstrating the additional benefits they could derive; to show pig producers that the firm was totally involved in the pig industry from breed improvement to end product marketing; to announce details of the forthcoming promotion for branded pork in conjunction with a national retailing organisation and explain the planning, research and other marketing techniques which were to be employed in such promotions; and to attract favourable editorial comments for BOCM, Dewhurst and Pig Marketing Services in local, national, meat trade and agricultural publications.

The Conference preceded the retail promotion in the North East but was closely integrated with it, and pig producers were invited to visit Dewhurst retail outlets to assess at first hand the impact of both lay-out and presentation of the meat and promotional material. A series of papers were presented at the conference covering: the market for fresh pork, future trends and the impact of UK entry into the EEC, the type of pig required for the fresh pork trade and the importance of guaranteed supplies of standard quality; the role of pig breeding in quality pork production; the new opportunities that existed for pig production in the North East; and finally, the story of the proposed production of 'Cracklean' pork in the North. Thus the Conference attempted to offer the farmer a day out that he could justify in terms of technical and marketing information gained and simultaneously to press upon him the advantages of both the BOCM/Silcock Pig Scheme and their range of products.

Consumer Advertising Campaign

The objects of the advertising campaign were to introduce the brand name to consumers and to establish a positive and favourable brand image. Specific consumer benefits that were to be offered included consistent and acceptable lean-to-fat ratio,

flavour and texture; good value for money; and pork that was specifically selected, carefully graded, locally produced and fresh from the farm. The media chosen (or rather largely dictated by the circumstances) were press and poster advertising and point-of-sale promotion.

One of the advertisements used is reproduced in Appendix C. The point-of-sale material consisted of window banners, price posters, product stabbers, carrier bags and the 'Cracklean' logo marked on the pork cuts. The press campaign used local newspapers: three advertisements were inserted over the four-week period with appropriate back-up for women's page editors. Over all media the copy stressed that the product was 'Cracklean Pork - the real farmhouse flavour'. The theme was based on information gained earlier from consumer group interviews.

The promotion was jointly financed by Dewhursts and BOCM/Silcock. The area incorporated the following districts and branches:

Yorkshire Region

Bradford district	24 branches
Leeds	18 branches
Wakefield	23 branches
York	25 branches

North East Coast Region

Barrow	18 branches
Durham	25 branches
Middlesbrough	21 branches
Newcastle	32 branches
Sunderland	29 branches

Total	<u>215 branches</u>
-------	---------------------

The campaign was launched on the 30th October and ran until 4th December, 1972.

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

The name:

The word associations with Cracklean pork differed from associations with pork mainly in that Cracklean evoked many more words describing the taste and texture, fewer country or farm associations, and fewer words on cuts or accompaniments of pork.

The discussion of the name Cracklean pork amplified these differences and suggested three main areas of expectation. The first was that the housewives thought Cracklean would be a very high quality pork. It was seen as likely to be close to an ideal pork, lean with little or no fat, yet still tender and juicy - "something they would be proud to put their name on". The name Cracklean also suggested crispy crackling and this was associated with such qualifications as tasty and appetising, and with the enjoyment of eating tasty pork. Cracklean also suggested clean pork and pork that was well trimmed and well cut.

The housewives assumed that Cracklean pork would be produced from scientifically bred and specially fed pigs to control for lean-to-fat ratios. They also thought there would be strict quality control on any pork labelled Cracklean so that high quality was maintained. They did not think that this modern scientific farming would diminish the natural taste because they assumed pigs could not be kept "inside like battery chickens". However the name Cracklean did make them think of scientific and perhaps factory farming. It was seen as a very modern word and this helps explain why they had fewer farm or countryside associations with Cracklean compared with pork.

The third area of discussion was on the way they expected to buy Cracklean. They assumed that Cracklean pork products would be processed. They thought that it would probably be pre-cooked sliced pork or at the very least pre-packaged trimmed pork in vacuum packs or 'boil-in-the-bag'. They thought that any brand name indicated pre-packaging - how else could they know they were buying Cracklean pork? The perceived modernity of Cracklean as a name also implied modernity in terms of presentation and retailing rather than butcher retailing. This "prepared" notion helps explain why they had associated cuts of pork less with Cracklean than with pork.

Cracklean appeared to be an ideal name in implying that the pork was appetising, that it was lean pork of very high

quality from pigs scientifically bred and fed. However it failed to suggest fresh agricultural produce, and other reassurance was obviously required, such as its presentation without packaging and the use of farm themes in the promotional material. It seems that initially any branding of agricultural products could lead housewives to expect processed or pre-packaged products rather than fresh. Since Cracklean had very positive quality and taste associations, it appeared to be a good brand name provided that a launch promotion emphasised that it was fresh produce.

The concept:

The concept of a branded quality pork was appealing because it implied reliability and made housewives less dependent on their butcher. The production of consistently high quality pork was seen as entirely feasible. However the housewives felt that retailing Cracklean might be a problem in that if it was not prepacked they could not be sure that the butcher was giving them Cracklean. (They did not spontaneously mention stamping.) The problem of selling high quality branded agricultural produce appeared to lie not in production credibility but retailer credibility.

Their suspicions were caused in part by their expectations about the price. They expected Cracklean pork to have a premium price and that therefore the retailer might be tempted to substitute other pork for Cracklean. The reason why they expected to pay more for Cracklean was that it would be better value with more meat and less fat per pound. They also saw price as an indicator of quality; without a premium price they could not see how it would be believably better quality.

They thought a price premium was needed also to reward the farmer for special, more costly, pig production; they did not believe that the extra return would come from greater sales of pork since they could not envisage eating more. They had few recipes for pork, using mainly chops and roasts.

The price premiums suggested were 2p to 5p per pound; the premiums were confined to cuts where quality was important - joints, fillets and chops, especially joints where leanness was less easy to recognize yet very important. They thought 1p per pound would be too marginal to be credibly better quality. They also assumed that the premium price implied that Cracklean would be selectively marketed to reputable quality butchers.

The promotional material:

The group discussion results were used to modify the material wherever negative reactions were detected or where confusion or misunderstanding was indicated. Hence most of the results were specific to the material shown. Several errors in style or words were found.

Names of cuts differ in various regions, and some were wrong for the North-East. Some cuts were not the "quality cuts" that had been expected and some prices seemed to the housewives much too low.

The farm theme and "olde worlde" writing appealed strongly to the housewives, giving Cracklean the old-fashioned sentimental associations with "real" butchers and farm produce that the name itself did not give. It toned down the modernity of the word Cracklean making it warmer and less scientific. The theme also countered the concept of processed, pre-packaged pork, not by direct claims used by food manufacturers but by visual imagery they could elaborate themselves.

Illustrations of waiters were rejected in favour of maids because waiters were associated with prepared or packaged restaurant food and the housewives preferred home cooked food which they felt was better than restaurant food. The word feast was also rejected because it again implied prepared food and also evoked feelings of indigestion associated with over-eating a rich meat. On the other hand words such as succulent, juicy, delicious and other strongly evocative epithets were entirely congruent with their own associations with Cracklean.

There also appeared a need for reassurance that Cracklean was English pork, rather than foreign produce; and, more generally, branded fresh meat had to be shown as local, direct from the farm and unprocessed. There seemed to be a need to surround a modern branding operation and its name with old fashioned virtues such as home cooking, the country and old fashioned butchers by using appropriate words and illustrations.

SALES TESTS

The design of the sales test has been discussed in the section on methodology. Briefly, the test criterion was whether relatively more pork was sold in the test towns of Sunderland and Leeds than in the control towns of Coventry and Nottingham during and immediately after the campaign.

The period of the campaign unfortunately coincided with a period of unprecedented rises in meat prices. Table 1 shows an index of pork, beef and lamb prices in the 'run-up', the campaign and the post-campaign periods. The base used was the four-week period before the six-week run-up period, i.e. weeks 10-7 before the campaign. The average of the prices of each meat over that four weeks was taken as 100, and the price for each succeeding week was calculated as a percentage of the base price. These are the figures presented in the table; also shown is the average index figure over each of the three periods. The prices used are wholesale prices for pork, English lamb (medium), and Scottish killed sides; the figures were kindly provided by MLC.

The summary figures are

	Run-up	Campaign	After
Lamb	90	89	98
Beef	99	107	118
Pork	112	117	127

Thus lamb prices were lower in the run-up than they had previously been, remained relatively low during the campaign and recovered during the post-campaign period; over all three periods lamb might be considered the meat that was still relatively cheap. Beef remained steady during the run-up weeks, rose to 107 during the campaign and to an average of 118 in the following three weeks, a rise of about 20% in the last seven weeks, an expensive meat getting even more expensive. Pork however rose most of all: in the run-up period the price was 12 points above the base period (the four weeks immediately before); during the campaign, it was up another 5 points to 117 and then up to 127 in the following period. Throughout pork prices would have seemed exceptionally high.

These price changes must have a confusing effect on the measurements of the campaign results. There are two ways of

dealing with them. The first is use the simple- and cross-elasticities of demand to predict the sales changes for each meat, and then to test the actual changes against the calculated price-induced changes. The objection to this method is that the elasticities used would be those calculated for other prices and quantities; to apply them as arc-elasticities across price changes of up to nearly 30% is really to assume that the elasticities for meat are broadly constant, a more than dubious assumption.

The second method is to ignore the price changes, rightly contending that the experiment was designed to control for such changes. These prices are national, applying as much to the control districts of Nottingham and Coventry as to the campaign districts of Leeds and Sunderland. Therefore as the test criterion is whether the sales changed more favourably to pork in the campaign districts than in the others, the price changes can be ignored. They need only be borne in mind as a reason why pork sales in all districts might have been moderated over the whole of this time.

The sales figures for the four districts are displayed in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 gives the weights of meat sold, Table 3 the sales by value. In both tables the figures are index numbers; the average for the six-week run-up period is the base of 100. The tables also show the average index figures over the campaign and post-campaign periods. They show, too, pork sales as a proportion of all red meat sales for each week and each period. Figures in the two tables broadly correspond, with the value table reflecting the price rises over the period. The analyses below are related to the sales-by-weight table, Table 2, to reduce the distortion due to price changes.

Looking first at sales of the three meats in the campaign periods, in Sunderland pork sales were up to 104%, beef and lamb were down; in Leeds too pork was up to 104, beef was up to 102 and lamb was down; in Nottingham all three were up, with pork reaching 108, beef 105 and lamb 104, and in Coventry pork was up at 103, but beef reached 122 and lamb 115. Thus in the two campaign areas pork sold relatively better than beef and lamb, with Sunderland showing a clear result and Leeds a marginal one; Leeds was approximately equalled by Nottingham, one of the control districts, while in the other control district pork sales were far outrun by beef and lamb.

In the post-campaign period, in Sunderland pork sales fell back slightly to 101, beef remained at 96 and lamb was further down to 85; in Leeds pork sales increased steeply to 132, while beef was unchanged at 102 and lamb fell further to 71; in

Nottingham pork came down to 104, beef remained at 105 and lamb rose marginally to 106; and in Coventry pork fell back to 100, beef was down somewhat at 116 but lamb went ahead to 125.

Taking the two periods together, in both test districts pork sold appreciably better than the other two meats, with Sunderland showing pork at 103 but beef down to 96 and lamb 88, while in the Leeds district pork rose to 116 and beef to 102 whereas lamb fell to 79. In the control districts pork did relatively less well: in Nottingham it rose to 106 but both beef and lamb rose too, to 105; in Coventry pork rose to 102 but beef at 120 and lamb at 119 were much stronger.

In brief, pork sales rose in all areas, despite the price increases, the difference between the test areas and the controls being that in both the test areas pork rose markedly compared with beef and lamb while in one control area the three meats fared about the same and in the other control area the pork rise was relatively much smaller than for the other meats.

In all areas pork sales rose at a time when the price of pork was rocketing, while lamb sales rose substantially in only one area, although lamb prices had fallen. This may be attributed to seasonal effects, but it might also be taken to reflect very low short-term demand elasticities.

Also of some interest is the fact that total sales of the three meats rose strongly in the control towns, but remained broadly unchanged in Leeds and fell in Sunderland. The explanation might be partly in the fact that poultry sales increased by 53% in Sunderland, 62% in Leeds, but only by 26% in both Coventry and Nottingham. Again the strong seasonal effect defied the price rises but in the more northern areas there was more movement into poultry.

The more obvious measure of the relative performance of pork against the other meats is shown in the last row of each section of the tables. This row displays the pork sales as a proportion of total meat sales. The summary figures are:

	Run-up	Campaign	After
Sunderland	29.7	31.9	31.2
Leeds	21.5	23.5	29.7
Nottingham	28.6	29.1	28.8
Coventry	34.5	30.4	29.8

Thus in the two campaign towns the pork, that is the 'Cracklean', proportion of total meat sales was raised by 2

percentage points or more; in the one control town the pork proportion was unchanged, in the other it fell. These results were tested for significance.

Statistically they were significant at the .01 level - there is less than a 1% probability that this difference would have occurred by chance. However the difference, a rise in share of two percentage points, is not overwhelming, and regardless of the value of the Cracklean concept, it must be expected that if in any period pork is being promoted, relatively more pork would be sold. More direct comment on Cracklean was yielded by the consumer survey.

In Leeds pork sales continued to increase relatively in the post-test period and in Coventry they fell; while in the other two areas they remained at the test period level. The promotion does seem to have had a residual effect, but of this too it is difficult to assess the value. The residual effect in which the brand owners would be interested is one that would last over years, and which could only be gained by a much longer and more powerful campaign; the evidence of a small percentage rise lasting a few extra weeks is encouraging but no more.

THE CONSUMER SURVEY

The consumer survey was designed to answer the questions on awareness of the campaign, on the effect of the campaign on attitudes, and on the reaction to the concept of branded meat; it was also used to get a reaction to the brand name Cracklean from a large sample of consumers.

On none of the questions were there established in advance any criteria for what would be a good answer, what levels, for instance, of awareness would mark the campaign as successful; the purpose was merely to measure what levels were reached. Clearly it would have been more acceptable, more useful and more satisfying in a test market to be able to declare that some particular figure, or band of figures, would mark the boundary between probable success and probable failure were the product to be launched nationally. However such a prognosis can only be made on the evidence of closely similar cases, and none was or is available. Its unique features were that it was a branded product in a previously unbranded market; it was being distributed through one group of outlets, and, as much of the promotion was in-store publicity, the effect must relate to the publicity material generally displayed in those outlets; and though the other media used (press and posters, and an editorial publicity campaign), are a common enough selection for a test market, the campaign was both short (four weeks) and not especially intense (a total expenditure of under £10,000 which is the national equivalent of merely £200,000); furthermore, on a national launch, TV would probably be heavily used and it could not be used for the test. Thus in the end, unless some information on other related experience did appear, what the research could yield were the levels attained and the subjective assessments of whether these levels were high or low.

Asked 'what does the word Cracklean make you think of?' (and shown the word in writing), 53% of the sample said 'pork'; 16% added, or only said, 'crackling' and 4% 'crispy'. The only counter-indication was that 1.7%, 20 people, said 'detergent' (Tables 4 and 5). However, separating the sample into age groups (Table 26) showed that of the under-twenties only 30% said that Cracklean made them think of pork.

There are two obvious ways in which 'Cracklean' would have evoked 'pork' as an association. The first is through the posters and other publicity which proclaimed 'Cracklean pork'. As most of the respondents had just come out from a Dewhurst's shop where the publicity material was displayed, it seems likely that this material had its due influence: on the other

hand, since the people under 20 years old had also been into the shop, the fact that proportionately fewer of them said 'pork' suggests some other influence. The second obvious source for the pork association is the similar-sounding 'crackling', whether or not it was specifically mentioned, and this association could well be less strong for younger people. The group discussions showed that 'crackling' is a strongly favourable association for pork; 'crispy' too would seem to be a desirable connotation in this context. Thus for more than half the respondents the brand-name suggested either the product or some favourable product attribute, which, even allowing for the direct effect of the publicity, must surely be as good as the best expectations would allow.

To 'what meat did you buy at Dewhurst's today?' 12% of the whole sample and 17% of the Dewhurst shoppers answered 'pork'; of them only 22 (1.9% of the whole sample) mentioned 'Cracklean' (Table 7) though even this number may not be negligible after only 3-4 weeks of promotion.

Over the previous 4 weeks 54% of the whole sample recalled buying pork from Dewhursts; 1.2% said that they had asked for Cracklean by name (Tables 8 and 9).

The question 'what did the butcher say?' evoked little positive response: most people remembered nothing other than conventional pleasantries or transactional statements, such as the state of the weather, and the price; there was little reference to meat characteristics and almost none to Cracklean (Table 10). All this might be expected, and indeed precise recall of an incidental exchange would be remarkable; but what the answers do seem to show is that insofar as people were aware of Cracklean, this was not just because they had noticed the butcher pushing the word at them, that any awareness can properly be attributed to more general, and repeatable, effects of the campaign.

This result may seem strange, considering the campaign's incentives to the butcher to make special efforts to sell Cracklean: did a holiday in Paris offer no attractions? One explanation of the apparent anomaly is that in a fairly busy shop the customers have generally decided what they want before they speak to the butcher, and to attempt to change their minds would be neither good salesmanship nor good service. Therefore the butcher promotes a particular meat by the emphasis he gives it in his display.

One of the central questions of the survey was 'had you noticed that Dewhursts have been selling Cracklean pork for the

past 4 weeks?'. Twenty eight per cent said they had (Table 11). There was marked similarity between the two areas - 29% in Sunderland, 28% in Leeds. A smaller proportion of the under 20's than of the other age groups said they had noticed (Table 12). Predictably a higher proportion of Dewhurst shoppers (31%) had noticed than of others (21%) (Table 13); Dewhurst shoppers were those coming out of Dewhursts that day, and not necessarily regulars: in fact of the regulars 35% had noticed, against only 14% of those who said they didn't usually buy their meat at Dewhursts (Table 14).

Is 35% a high figure or a low one? Would it have been expected that more or fewer of Dewhurst's regular customers would have noticed that for between three and four weeks their butcher had been selling pork with a particular name? Would one have expected that more or less than 14% of other shoppers had noticed? Given that the concept was new but was not being publicised as new and given that the campaign in general appearance was similar to some other Dewhurst promotions, but given also that the question provided a direct aid to recall there does not seem to be any standard for comparison. Perhaps the closest comparison is with aided recall of poster advertisements; the average awareness for a four-week poster campaign using 16-sheet posters is also just 35% (British Poster Bureau).

Clearly the shop itself was the important source of information. This finding was confirmed by answers to the question 'where did you first hear of Cracklean?'. Nineteen per cent of the answers referred to the shop window or other shop display, 3.5% to newspaper advertisements and 2.5% to posters (Table 15). A faithful 1.1% attributed their knowledge to television - though perhaps they had seen something of the press conference. The effect of the shop display was, naturally, stronger among Dewhurst shoppers (21%) than others (12%) (Table 16) and even more so among Dewhurst regulars (23%) than occasionals (9%) (Table 17). The only other difference was that the posters had been noticed more by the regulars. The under 21's, fewer of whom had noticed that Dewhursts were selling Cracklean, had correspondingly been less affected by all media.

With prompting, some of the scores improved: shop recall stayed at 21% but the newspaper advertisements were revised to 9% and the posters to 8% (Tables 18, 19 and 20). The differences between Dewhurst regulars and others, and Dewhurst shoppers and others were maintained.

Few people were able to recall any content of the advertisements beyond the fact that they were for Cracklean (Tables 21

and 22). However the fact mentioned earlier that the associations were with pork may show that the message was received even though it was not directly recalled.

The question 'in what ways do you think Cracklean pork is different from any other pork?' seems to be a firm test of the name and the concept. 'Cracklean' triumphed. A mere 9% said that the only difference was the name. Another 35% didn't know. The other 55% found positive advantages for Cracklean. Twenty-two per cent thought it had more crackling or was crispier; 17% said it was leaner, 4% that it was better quality; 22½% offered more than one difference and of them 10% included leanness as one of their differences (Tables 23 and 24).

The younger shoppers mentioned leanness relatively more often, the middle age-groups tended more to say 'crackling' and the over 65s said 'quality'. Relatively more of the 31-50 and the over 65 groups said that the only difference was the name (Table 25).

Even allowing for the fact that the question must tend to provoke some positive answer, these results do suggest that people are ready to accept that a pork named Cracklean is in some defined way better than 'ordinary pork'.

Another strongly favourable response was given to the next main question. Having been told that Cracklean is high quality pork they were then asked, 'if Dewhursts were selling ordinary pork alongside Cracklean with the ordinary pork one penny a pound cheaper, which would you buy,'.

Fifty-four per cent said they would buy the Cracklean, 18% the cheaper pork, 20% didn't know and 9% would buy none (Table 26). The reasons for their choice were: on the Cracklean side, higher quality (29%), value for money (7%), leanness (6%), with only 1% for more crackling; against Cracklean, 17% said they would go for the lower price; 7% said that they would want to see both meats before deciding and 10% would want to try both (Table 27).

Willingness to buy the more expensive pork increased with age, apart from the over 65s (Table 28). There were also some differences in the reasons given by the different age groups for whatever choices they made. The under 31s emphasised leanness and included proportionately more of those who would judge on appearance, the 30-65s gave answers that were classed as 'quality' and the over 65s stressed value for money (Table 29) though overall the differences shown in this table were not statistically significant.

Again the Dewhurst people were more favourably inclined to Cracklean. Of the Dewhurst shoppers 56% said they would buy the more expensive Cracklean and of the Dewhurst regulars 61% said this (Tables 30 and 31). In both analyses the Dewhurst people gave as their reason quality and the others gave lower price (Tables 32 and 33).

Certainly 1p a pound, though not negligible, is not a great differential and these hypothetical price questions can be misleading. There could be all kinds of reasons why a consumer might say she would pay a particular price, for example prestige, yet when the actual occasion arose she might do nothing of the sort. However the answers to the question 'why would you be willing to pay more?' do give some grounds for confidence. For example, proportionately more of Dewhurst's customers had earlier given meat quality as their reason for choosing a butcher, and now proportionately more of Dewhurst's customers said that they would pay the extra penny to get higher quality. Also the fact that pensioners especially expressed concern with getting value for money and that younger people appeared more sceptical of the value of a brand name are facts that accord with common experience. Thus the answers to the 'why?' question seem at least superficially valid and give some reason to suppose that the answers to the 'whether?' question might not be entirely nonsense.

The real argument for a price premium on Cracklean is that the whole reason for branding the meat is to increase profitability, so that a premium price is probably necessary. Of course this does not mean that a premium could be gained, merely that without one the project is hardly viable. To make an adequate test of what premium might be gained would require actual shop trials (which should be included at the next stage of the product development); and even the trials can only approximate to the conditions that would obtain when the brand had become well-established. However, conceding all that, what the present findings show is that the verbal reaction to the idea of paying slightly more for a branded product is encouraging to put it at its mildest.

Quite as encouraging were the answers to the next two questions, the last important ones of the survey. Respondents were asked whether they thought it a good idea to call high quality pork by a special name, and, then, why they thought it was/was not a good idea. Sixty per cent thought it was a good idea and only 22% were definitely against (Table 34) and again Dewhurst customers were more strongly favourable than others (Table 35) while there were no significant overall age differences (Table 36); however a higher proportion of Sunderland

than Leeds housewives thought it a good idea (Table 37).

Of the reasons given for it being considered a good idea to call high quality meat by a special name, 21% were coded as 'easier to ask for', 19% as 'guarantee of quality', 8% as 'best should have a name' and 5% that a name 'showed the difference' (Table 38). Such answers are clearly expressions of related ideas, and some of the verbatim answers could equally well have been allocated to either of two codes. They amount to the standard justification for branding - ensuring that one regularly could obtain a reliable quality. Once more, these answers emphasise the acceptability of the principle of branding meat. Five per cent of the respondents linked the question with Cracklean and said they thought the name 'sounded good' or 'sounded appetising'. Twenty-one per cent were against because the only difference was the name, and 5% associated the idea with the meat being too expensive.

Thus the principal findings of the survey were:

1. Of the sample of 1,182, 53% said 'Cracklean' made them think of pork.
2. Twenty eight per cent of the whole sample said they had noticed that Dewhursts were selling Cracklean and of Dewhurst's regular customers 35% had noticed.
3. The butcher's shop and window display was the most effective medium for this communication.
4. Fifty five per cent thought Cracklean was in some way better than ordinary pork.
5. Fifty four per cent would buy it at 1p a lb more than ordinary pork.
6. Sixty per cent thought it a good idea to call high quality pork by a special name.
7. In general Dewhurst customers were more favourable towards Cracklean and the idea than were other shoppers.

The overwhelming impression left by the survey is that

(a) the idea of branded meat does appeal to the public

(b) 'Cracklean' is a good brand name.

MARKETING AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Pricing:

The test market demonstrates that meat can be branded and that publicity for the brand can encourage purchasing. The key question is whether branding, with its attendant publicity and quality reassurance, can obtain a price premium for farmer, wholesaler and retailer. The research has indicated that many housewives readily say yes to a price premium. But would they regularly buy at the premium price?

A shop test or mini test market should be set up where various price premiums for Cracklean compared with ordinary pork are tested out on different cuts. The marketing and profit implications of a 3p price premium compared with a 1p price premium are substantial.

The Butcher:

The report is based on consumer purchasing and consumer awareness of Cracklean pork. Branding meat also affects the butcher and the butcher's own attitude affects consumer buying.

Research amongst butchers and their wholesalers is needed to ascertain the advantages and disadvantages they perceive. This would provide information on how the concept should be presented to them, what share of the price premium they should have and how they could help in a consumer promotion campaign.

Identification of the Product:

Although meat may eventually be packaged, at the moment stamping is the only method of labelling a brand of fresh meat. Both butcher and housewife awareness and perceptions of labels should be checked to find the most effective form of labelling and to show how the label should be publicised.

Merchandising and Product Quality Control:

When brands are promoted in the grocery trade, merchandisers are usually provided by the manufacturer to ensure that the displays are positioned to maximum advantage. Meat branding would probably require merchandisers not only to arrange the displays, but also to check that Cracklean pork itself always looks appetising and fresh.

Monitoring Awareness and Attitudes:

As with most branded products, Cracklean or any other branded meat must depend on consumer awareness and buying preference, and these in turn depend on advertising and continuing usage satisfaction. Consumer perceptions will need to be regularly monitored.

Finance and Rationale

The research requirements and marketing services outlined cost money. However branding is a method of gaining additional revenue that will be used to finance advertising, retail profits and additional "manufacturer" profits. Consumers and even retailers benefit from quality control and constant high standards. Manufacturers benefit from additional revenue and volume sales.

The marketing services and marketing plans for a national brand launch require additional information as well as substantial commitment to a fully developed marketing operation.

Table 1: Index of Weekly Prices for Carcase Meats for the Three Periods

(Average of 4 weeks preceding the first period = 100)

<u>Pork</u>	Average on four preceding weeks	Pre-Campaign Weeks						Campaign Weeks				Post-Campaign Weeks		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean for period	100	111	111	113	111	114	113	114	116	118	121	126	131	124
							112				117			127
<u>Beef</u>	100	99	100	99	98	100	101	104	107	108	109	115	117	122
Mean for period							99				107			118
<u>Lamb</u>	100	91	95	91	89	86	89	89	82	90	93	95	95	105
Mean for period							90				89			98

Table 2: Index of Dewhurst's Weekly Sales by Weight for Carcase Meats for the
Three Periods (average of first period = 100)

	Pre-Campaign Weeks						Average of Period	Campaign Weeks				Average of Period	Post-Campaign Weeks			Average of Period
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9	10		11	12	13	
<u>Sunderland</u>																
Pork	102	99	106	104	94	95	100	103	112	111	92	104	89	84	131	101
Beef	110	95	99	96	102	98	100	99	96	94	93	96	96	93	100	96
Lamb	99	110	94	91	108	96	100	88	89	98	85	90	87	92	77	85
Pork %	28.7	29.5	31.4	31.5	27.6	29.3	29.7	31.2	33.6	33.0	29.9	31.9	28.7	27.6	37.3	31.2
<u>Nottingham</u>																
Pork	97	93	98	102	104	105	100	104	110	117	102	108	101	103	108	104
Beef	103	96	110	104	92	104	100	99	102	107	113	105	106	103	107	105
Lamb	101	97	103	108	93	98	100	93	103	110	109	104	97	113	107	106
Pork %	27.5	28.0	28.0	28.1	31.0	29.3	28.6	29.5	29.4	29.6	27.8	29.1	28.9	28.1	29.4	29.0
<u>Leeds</u>																
Pork	99	102	104	104	92	98	100	116	101	103	97	104	109	146	141	132
Beef	104	95	92	108	104	98	100	110	105	76	116	102	91	114	101	102
Lamb	98	108	99	103	117	74	100	90	92	85	71	84	62	66	86	71
Pork %	21.6	22.6	23.8	21.6	15.9	23.4	21.5	23.9	22.0	27.0	21.0	23.5	27.3	29.1	29.3	28.6
<u>Coventry</u>																
Pork	117	95	102	104	97	85	100	106	98	100	107	103	92	110	98	100
Beef	114	79	96	95	138	77	100	137	108	125	120	122	117	125	107	116
Lamb	154	67	70	114	146	49	100	142	98	122	98	115	114	152	110	125
Pork %	31.6	39.2	37.2	34.1	25.8	39.1	34.5	27.9	32.2	28.9	32.5	30.4	28.7	29.3	31.5	29.8

Table 3: Index of Dewhurst's Weekly Sales by Value for Carcase Meats for theThree Periods (average of first period = 100)

	Pre-Campaign Weeks						Average of Period	Campaign Weeks				Average	Post-Campaign Weeks			Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9	10		11	12	13	
<u>Sunderland</u>																
Pork	100	94	103	107	97	99	100	103	120	114	100	109	100	102	154	119
Beef	109	93	97	96	105	100	100	103	99	101	103	101	106	104	117	109
Lamb	107	113	95	87	102	96	100	92	92	99	92	94	94	101	88	94
Pork %	28.4	29.1	31.5	32.9	28.7	30.0	30.1	30.6	34.6	32.9	30.0	32.0	29.5	29.7	37.8	32.3
<u>Nottingham</u>																
Pork	100	95	96	100	103	106	100	105	105	114	103	107	112	115	112	113
Beef	98	94	99	98	103	108	100	104	101	121	107	108	104	105	114	108
Lamb	97	92	98	108	112	93	100	86	114	108	100	102	107	120	127	118
Pork %	25.9	25.8	24.9	25.1	25.0	25.8	25.4	26.7	25.5	24.9	25.2	25.6	26.7	26.3	24.5	25.8
<u>Leeds</u>																
Pork	91	102	101	107	95	102	100	122	111	117	107	114	123	166	147	145
Beef	100	91	91	106	107	102	100	116	106	81	127	107	104	128	122	118
Lamb	103	110	101	100	111	74	100	86	91	88	72	84	70	70	93	78
Pork %	21.5	24.2	24.5	23.6	20.8	24.6	23.2	25.5	24.7	29.7	22.5	25.6	28.2	31.1	28.1	29.1
<u>Coventry</u>																
Pork	110	92	101	101	103	93	100	112	106	108	118	111	102	123	119	115
Beef	108	78	98	93	143	79	100	143	106	133	132	129	130	137	131	133
Lamb	155	69	70	114	145	48	100	138	95	120	100	113	120	158	121	133
Pork %	27.2	33.6	31.9	29.5	23.0	35.8	30.2	24.7	29.9	25.8	28.7	27.3	25.1	26.3	27.9	26.4

Table 4: The First Thing (if any) that the Word
Cracklean Makes You Think of

	Numbers	%
Pork	630	53.3
Other food	153	12.9
Bacon	40	3.4
Detergent	20	1.7
Others	3	.3
D.K./N.A.	336	28.4
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 5: The Second Thing (if any) that the Word
Cracklean Makes You Think of

	Numbers	%
Crackling	188	15.9
Crispy	50	4.2
Lean	22	1.9
Others	32	2.7
D.K./N.A.	890	75.3
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 6: Cracklean Pork is in fact High Quality
Pork. If Dewhursts were selling Ordinary
Pork alongside Cracklean with the Ordinary
Pork one penny a pound cheaper, which
would you buy?

	Numbers	%
Cracklean	635	53.7
Ordinary Pork	207	17.5
None	101	8.5
D.K./N.A.	239	20.3
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 7: What Meat did you buy in Dewhursts today?

	Numbers	%
Neither	697	59.0
Pork	147	12.4
Cracklean	22	1.9
D.K./N.A.	316	26.7
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 8: About how many times have you bought Pork from any Branch of Dewhursts within the past four Weeks?

	Numbers	%
Twice	238	20.1
Once	208	17.6
More than twice	192	16.3
D.K./N.A.	544	46.0
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 9: As far as you can remember what did you ask for?

	Numbers	%
Pork	472	39.9
Cut on Display	28	2.4
Others	24	2.1
Cracklean	14	1.2
Butcher recommends	12	1.0
D.K./N.A.	632	53.5
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 10: And what did the Butcher say?

	Numbers	%
Other	75	6.4
Pork is good, etc.	14	1.2
Cracklean mentioned	7	0.6
D.K./N.A.	1,086	91.9
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 11: Had you noticed that Dewhursts have been
selling Cracklean Pork for the last four
Weeks?

	Numbers	%
No	808	68.4
Yes	336	28.4
D.K./N.A.	38	3.3
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 12: Had you noticed that Dewhursts have been
selling Cracklean Pork for the last four
Weeks - by estimated Age

Age:	< 20	21-30	31-50	51-65	65+	Row %
Yes	18.6	29.6	28.5	30.1	25.9	28.5
No	81.4	67.6	67.7	67.6	69.4	68.3
D.K.	0.0	2.8	3.7	2.3	4.7	3.2
Column %	3.7	27.6	46.2	15.2	7.3	100.0

Chi Square = 6.22703 with 8 D.F.
P = .25

Table 13: Had you noticed that Dewhursts have been
selling Cracklean Pork for the last four
Weeks - by Dewhurst Shoppers or Other

	Dewhurst	Others	Row %
Yes	20.6	31.2	28.4
No	75.8	65.8	68.4
D.K./N.A.	3.6	3.1	3.2
Column %	25.9	74.1	100.0

Chi Square = 12.46878 with 2 D.F.
P = .99

Table 14: Had you noticed that Dewhursts have been selling Cracklean Pork for the last four Weeks (rows) by do you usually buy your Meat at Dewhursts (columns)?

	Yes	No	D.K./N.A.	Row %
Yes	34.8	14.2	7.4	28.4
No	62.4	81.9	85.2	68.4
D.K./N.A.	2.8	3.9	7.4	3.2
Column %	69.7	28.0	2.3	100.0

Chi Square = 56.38316 with 4 D.F.

P = .99

Table 15: How or where did you first hear of Cracklean Pork?

	Numbers	%
Window Display	222	18.8
Newspaper ads.	41	3.5
Posters	30	2.5
Other	15	1.3
On T.V.	13	1.1
Butcher	12	1.0
Friends	6	0.5
D.K./N.A.	843	71.3
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 16: How or where did you hear of Cracklean Pork, versus, do you usually buy your Meat at Dewhursts?

	Yes	No	D.K./N.A.	Row %
Butcher	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.0
Window Displays	23.4	8.8	0.0	18.8
Posters	3.3	0.6	3.7	2.5
Newspaper ads.	3.5	3.6	0.0	3.5
Friends	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.5
On T.V.	1.3	0.6	0.0	1.1
Others	1.3	0.9	3.7	1.3
D.K./N.A.	64.9	85.5	92.6	71.3
Column %	69.7	28.0	2.3	100.0

Chi Square = 71.26775 with 16 D.F.

P = .99 45

Table 17: How or where did you first hear of
Cracklean Pork, versus, Dewhurst
Shoppers or Other

	Other	Dewhurst	Row %
Butcher	1.0	1.0	1.0
Window Displays	12.4	21.0	18.8
Posters	2.6	2.5	2.5
Newspaper ads.	3.3	3.5	3.5
Friends	0.7	0.5	0.5
On T.V.	0.3	1.4	1.1
Other	1.0	1.4	1.3
D.K./N.A.	78.8	68.8	71.3
Column %	25.9	74.1	100.0

Chi Square = 20.04074 with 8 D.F.

P = .99

Table 18: Have you noticed Cracklean mentioned
in the Displays in Shops?

	Numbers	%
No	918	77.7
Yes	246	20.8
D.K./N.A.	18	1.5
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 19: Have you noticed Cracklean mentioned
in Newspaper Advertisements?

	Numbers	%
No	1,042	88.2
Yes	107	9.1
D.K./N.A.	33	2.8
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 20: Have you noticed Cracklean mentioned on Posters?

	Numbers	%
No	1,059	89.6
Yes	96	8.1
D.K./N.A.	27	2.3
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 21: What did the Media show and say?

	Numbers	%
Cracklean	184	15.6
Dewhursts	30	2.5
Pork	23	1.9
Traditional	13	1.1
Flavour	11	0.9
Value	8	0.7
Quality	6	0.5
D.K./N.A.	907	76.7
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 22: What did the Displays/Newspaper Advertisements/Posters show and say?

	Numbers	%
Cracklean	177	15.0
Pork	30	2.5
Dewhurst	27	2.3
Traditional	23	1.9
Quality	10	0.8
Flavour	7	0.6
Value	3	0.3
Freshness	1	0.1
D.K./N.A.	904	76.5
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 23: In what ways do you think Cracklean is
different from any other Pork? (first
difference mentioned)

	Numbers	%
Leaner	204	17.3
More Crackling	153	12.9
Just name	111	9.4
Crisper	108	9.1
Other	106	9.0
Better Quality	46	3.9
Different Breed, Feed	16	1.4
Fresher	12	1.0
D.K./N.A.	426	36.1
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 24: In what ways do you think Cracklean is
different from any other Pork? (second
difference mentioned)

	Numbers	%
Leaner	115	9.7
Other	56	4.7
More Crackling	32	2.7
Crisper	22	1.9
Better Quality	18	1.5
Fresher	10	0.8
Other	8	0.7
Different Breed, Feed	5	0.4
D.K./N.A.	916	77.5
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 25: In what ways do you think Cracklean is
different from any other Pork, by
estimated age

	< 20	21-30	31-50	51-65	65+	Row %
More Crackling	9.3	13.4	11.6	22.7	4.7	13.2
Crisper	16.3	9.3	9.7	6.2	9.4	9.3
Leaner	23.3	17.8	18.8	9.7	18.8	17.3
Better Quality	0.0	4.4	2.8	4.0	11.8	4.0
Fresher	0.0	0.6	1.1	1.7	1.2	1.0
Diff. breed, feed	2.3	0.9	1.3	2.8	0.0	1.4
Other	4.7	7.2	9.1	11.4	14.1	9.1
Just Name	4.7	6.5	11.6	6.2	12.9	9.2
D.K./N.A.	39.5	39.9	33.9	35.3	27.1	35.5
Column %	3.7	27.6	46.2	15.2	7.3	100.0

Chi Square = 74.47495 with 36 D.F.
P = .99

Table 26: The first thing (if any) that the word
Cracklean makes you think of, by
estimated age

	N.A.	< 20	21-30	31-50	51-65	65+	Row %
Pork	71.4	30.2	53.3	54.9	54.5	48.2	53.3
Bacon	0.0	14.0	3.4	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.4
Other food	9.5	23.3	10.9	11.8	17.6	14.1	12.9
Detergent	0.0	2.3	3.7	0.9	0.6	1.2	1.7
Others	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3
D.K./N.A.	19.0	30.3	28.4	29.3	24.4	32.9	28.4
Column %	1.8	3.6	27.2	45.3	14.9	7.2	100.0

Table 27: Why?

	Numbers	%
Better Quality	337	28.5
Lower Price	206	17.4
Other	193	16.3
Try first	115	9.7
Value for Money	82	6.9
Appearance	77	6.5
Leanness	71	6.0
More Crackling	16	1.4
D.K./N.A.	85	7.2
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 28: Cracklean Pork is in fact high quality Pork.

If Dewhursts were selling ordinary Pork
alongside Cracklean with the ordinary Pork
one penny a pound cheaper, which would you
buy, by estimated age

	< 20	21-30	31-50	51-65	65+	Row %
Cracklean	41.9	49.2	54.9	61.9	52.9	53.7
Ordinary Pork	16.3	17.8	17.2	16.5	21.2	17.5
None	20.9	7.5	8.2	6.8	11.8	8.5
D.K./N.A.	20.9	25.5	19.8	14.8	14.1	20.2
Column %	3.7	27.6	46.2	15.2	7.3	100.0

Chi Square = 28.39079 with 16 D.F.

P = .95

Table 29: Why, versus estimated age

	< 20	21-30	31-50	51-65	65+	Row %
Better Quality	20.9	24.3	30.6	32.4	30.6	28.8
Value for Money	2.3	7.8	6.9	4.5	11.8	7.0
Leanness	7.0	6.9	6.0	5.7	4.7	6.1
More Crackling	2.3	1.2	1.3	1.1	2.4	1.4
Lower Price	16.3	19.0	16.8	15.3	20.0	17.4
Appearance	11.6	8.4	5.2	6.8	5.9	6.6
Try first	4.7	11.5	9.1	10.8	4.7	9.6
Other	23.3	14.0	16.6	17.0	16.5	16.2
D.K./N.A.	11.7	6.9	7.4	6.3	3.5	7.0
Column %	3.7	27.6	46.2	15.2	7.3	100.0

Chi Square = 29.92313 with 36 D.F.
N.S.

Table 30: Cracklean Pork is in fact high quality
Pork. If Dewhursts were selling ordinary
Pork alongside Cracklean with the ordinary
Pork one penny a pound cheaper, which
would you buy, by Dewhurst shop or other
Butcher

	Dewhurst	Others	Row %
Cracklean	46.7	56.2	53.7
Ordinary Pork	19.6	16.8	17.5
None	11.8	7.4	8.5
Other	0.3	0.1	0.2
D.K./N.A.	21.6	19.5	20.1
Column %	25.9	74.1	100.0

Table 31: Cracklean Pork is in fact high quality Pork.
If Dewhursts were selling ordinary Pork
alongside Cracklean with the ordinary Pork
one penny a pound cheaper, which would you
buy, by do you usually buy your Meat at
Dewhursts?

	Yes	No	D.K.	Row %
Cracklean	60.6	38.4	33.3	53.7
Ordinary Pork	15.0	24.5	7.4	17.5
None	6.7	12.4	18.5	8.5
D.K./N.A.	17.8	24.8	40.7	20.2
Column %	69.7	28.0	2.3	100.0

Chi Square = 64.65704
P = .99

Table 32: Why, versus, Dewhurst Shop or other
Butcher

	Dewhurst	Other	Row %
Better Quality	22.5	30.6	28.5
Value for Money	5.6	7.4	6.9
Leanness	5.2	6.3	6.0
More Crackling	0.7	1.6	1.4
Lower Price	21.9	15.9	17.4
Appearance	4.9	7.1	6.5
Try first	10.5	9.5	9.7
Other	19.3	15.3	16.3
D.K./N.A.	9.4	6.4	7.2
Column %	25.9	74.1	100.0

Table 33: Why, versus, do you usually buy your Meat
at Dewhursts?

	Yes	No	D.K.	Row %
Better Quality	32.8	17.8	29.6	28.5
Value for Money	6.3	8.8	3.7	6.9
Leanness	6.1	6.3	0.0	6.0
More Crackling	1.7	0.6	0.0	1.4
Lower Price	15.3	23.6	7.4	17.4
Appearance	6.3	6.3	14.8	6.5
Try first	9.6	10.6	3.7	9.7
Other	15.2	18.7	22.2	16.3
D.K./N.A.	6.8	7.2	18.5	7.2
Column %	69.7	28.0	2.3	100.0

Chi Square = 52.44287 with 18 D.F.

P = .99

Table 34: Do you think it is a good idea to call
high quality Meat by a special Name?

	Numbers	%
Yes	713	60.3
No	259	21.9
D.K./N.A.	210	17.8
	<hr/> 1,182	<hr/> 100.0

Table 35: Do you think it is a good idea to call
high quality meat by a special name,
by do you usually buy your meat at
Dewhursts?

	Yes	No	D.K.	Row %
Yes	63.1	55.3	37.0	60.3
No	18.1	29.9	40.7	21.9
D.K.	18.8	14.8	22.2	17.8
Column %	69.7	28.0	2.3	100.0

Chi Square = 26.86470 with 4 D.F.

P = .99

Table 36: Do you think it is a good idea to call high quality meat by a special name, by age of respondent

	< 20	21-30	31-50	51-65	65+	Row %
Yes	65.1	60.7	59.3	63.6	55.3	60.3
No	20.9	23.1	23.1	16.5	23.5	22.0
D.K./N.A.	14.0	16.2	17.5	19.9	21.2	17.7
Column %	3.7	27.6	46.2	15.2	7.3	100.0

Chi Square = 5.77440 with 8 D.F.
N.S.

Table 37: Do you think it is a good idea to call high quality meat by a special name, by area

	Sunderland	Leeds	Row %
Yes	64.7	53.0	60.3
No	19.9	25.3	21.9
D.K.	15.5	21.7	17.8
Column %	62.9	37.1	100.0

Chi Square = 16.00262 with 2 D.F.
P = .99

Table 38: Why?

	Numbers	%
No diff. only a name	252	21.3
Easy to ask for	244	20.6
Guarantees quality	228	19.3
Best should have name	98	8.3
Other	86	7.3
Show diff.	62	5.2
Too expensive	54	4.6
Sound Al	53	4.5
D.K./N.A.	105	8.9
	1,182	100.0

APPENDIX A

Housewives' attitudes to Pork and Pork Cuts

Housewives considered pork to be an appetising and nourishing meat (although not in the same class as beef) that was both tasty and tender. It was thought particularly good as a cold meat, had a traditional image and if quality was desired then should be bought from the traditional butcher's shop. However it was a greasy meat, that was overfat, indigestible, not particularly versatile and finally rather expensive.

The attitude survey was based on the assumption that attitudes to pork were monolithic. Further research carried out in the Department of Agricultural Marketing, however, argued that it is the attitude to an individual cut, e.g. pork chops or leg of pork, that is relevant because it is the individual cut that is bought rather than an amorphous product termed pork. Attitudes to three pork cuts were investigated.

Leg of pork was thought to be a cut which had good eating qualities, i.e. it had good flavour, was tasty, very nourishing, tender and juicy. It had excellent re-use properties as it made a very good cold meat, was easy to carve and had 'plenty of cutting' on it. It was thought reasonably economical but was rather wasteful as it was not very lean and had rather too much bone.

Belly pork, on the other hand, was thought to have rather poor eating qualities. It was not as tasty or as nourishing as leg of pork, but was considered a juicy meat. On 're-use' it scored unfavourably particularly with respect to its use as a cold meat, and on the amount of cutting that it had available, i.e. it was not the solid block of meat, that can be easily carved, that the housewife so much desires. However it had a relatively economic image and perhaps surprisingly was not thought to be a wasteful meat.

Pork chops had excellent image for eating quality - very tasty, tender and flavoursome that were juicy and nourishing. However it was thought an extremely wasteful cut, with too much bone and fat and therefore not economical.

This form of comparative attitude study identifies characteristics that are common to all cuts of meat but it does not isolate the factors that are unique to certain types and cuts. A sample of housewives was, therefore, asked to participate in a word association test to research the spontaneous unguided

response to certain cuts of meat. Roast pork, leg of pork and pork chops were three such word stimuli. All three were strongly associated with their traditional accompaniments, apple sauce and stuffing. The two roasts also had strong associations with crackling and with Sunday or Christmas meals, i.e. the celebration meat with the 'crispy', 'crackly' skin. Follow up in group interviews to the responses gained in the word association tests emphasised the importance of good crackling on pork if it was to be thought appetising and nourishing. Many housewives, however, mentioned that they found it very difficult to make crackling 'like you could in the old days'.

APPENDIX B: CONSUMER SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE Survey CP3A

- (1) What does the word Cracklean make you think of?

(SHOW CRACKLEAN LABEL)

- (2) Do you usually buy your meat at Dewhursts?

Yes/No/D.K.

(IF YES GO TO 4)

- (3) Why did you go to Dewhursts today?

- (4) What meat did you buy in Dewhursts today?

Cracklean/Pork/Neither

- (5) About how many times have you bought pork from any branch of Dewhursts within the past four weeks?

0 1 2 >2 D.K.

(IF NO OR D.K. GO TO 7)

- (6) As far as you can remember what did you ask for?

(IF INTERVIEW INSIDE SHOP GO TO 7)

- (7) Had you noticed that Dewhursts have been selling Cracklean pork for the last four weeks?

Yes/No/D.K.

- (8)a How or where did you first hear of Cracklean pork?

(IF NEVER HEARD OF BEFORE INTERVIEW GO TO 9)

- b What did the _____ (butcher/
window display/poster/newspaper
advertisements/your friend/other)
show and say?

- (9) Have you noticed Cracklean mentioned in
- (a) the displays in shops Yes/No/D.K.
 - (b) newspaper advertisements Yes/No/D.K.
 - (c) posters Yes/No/D.K.
 - (d) what did the displays/newspapers/posters show and say?

- (10) In what ways do you think Cracklean is different from any other pork?
(PROBE)

What other ways?

- (11) Cracklean pork is in fact high quality pork. If Dewhursts were selling ordinary pork alongside Cracklean with the ordinary pork one penny a pound cheaper, which would you buy?
Cracklean/Ordinary Pork/None/D.K.
- (12) Why?
- (13) Do you think it is a good idea to call high quality meat by a special name? Yes/No/D.K.
- (14) Why?

(CLOSE INTERVIEW. RECORD YOUR ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW)

Sex of Respondent F
 M

Estimated Age

Interview conducted inside shop/outside shop

Day No. _____ Shop No. _____

LOCAL

CRACKLEAN PORK

The real
Farmhouse Flavour

Delicious
Chops, Spare Rib

38p per lb



Tasty
Pig's Liver

22p per lb



DEWHURST
The Master Butcher

Other branch names in the Dewhurst family: Eastmans,
Hammett, W. & R. Fletcher and in Scotland, Alex Munro.

