

Lean Meats Make the Grade: A Collaborative Nutrition Intervention Program

Rebecca M. Mullis*

Phyllis Pirie

Introduction

Historically, the meat industry and health groups have provided two quite different positions regarding the relationship between health and the consumption of red meat (Am. Heart Assn., 1982; Price, 1984). Meat producers have claimed that all meat consumption is safe and healthy, while health promotion experts expressed the concern that meat consumption was a major contributor to fat in the diet and should be limited or even avoided. These opposing views have left the consumer frustrated and confused, creating a need for a consistent message about the role of lean meat in a healthy diet. In this context, "Lean Meats Make the Grade" was formulated. The program, a collaborative project with the Minnesota Beef Council and the Minnesota Pork Producers Council, was initiated by the Minnesota Heart Health Program (MHHP). MHHP is a community research and demonstration project designed to reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease, using a variety of health promotion strategies in three upper midwest communities (Blackburn et al., 1984). Initiators of "Lean Meats Make the Grade" recognized that if the messages from a health promotion group and the meat industry could be coupled into one program, consumers would receive a clear, consistent message about lean cuts of red meat in a healthy diet. "Lean Meats Make the Grade" is the first collaborative effort of its kind between a health promotion program and an agricultural commodity group. The specific purposes of this program are to educate consumers about how to identify leaner cuts of meat, how to prepare low-fat meat, and how to determine appropriate meat portion size. In the process, they learn that lean meats can be incorporated in a health-promoting diet and can be both tasty and easy to prepare. Consumers further learn that experts from a variety of disciplines are conveying consistent messages about the need to reduce dietary fat.

In the collaborative project, the MHHP established nutrient criteria for lean cuts of meat and trained meat department managers and food demonstrators. The meat industry provided information about meat preparation methods and funding for the project, including product taste testing and consumer education materials.

*R.M. Mullis, *Division of Epidemiology, University of Minnesota, Stadium Gate 27, 611 Beacon Street, Southeast, Minneapolis, MN 55455*

Reciprocal Meat Conference Proceedings, Volume 40, 1987.

Program Components

Prior to program implementation, two major components were necessary: (1) Cooperative agreements between MHHP and the meat industry, and (2) Training. The cooperative agreements included an initial proposal describing the contributions of both MHHP and the meat industry and a second grocer/meat manager agreement. The MHHP contribution included:

- a. Consultation with the meat industry on which cuts of meat met existing MHHP criteria. (Note: MHHP had established criteria for lean cuts of beef and pork prior to this collaborative effort. Criteria for "lean" were based on the Minnesota B-Score (Anderson et al., 1979).
- b. Endorsement of meat products which met MHHP criteria.
- c. Coordination of taste testing with participating grocery stores throughout the pilot.
- d. Training of demonstrators about appropriate portion size, meal planning and preparation with lean meat.
- e. Publicity for lean meat cuts and their use through MHHP's education program.
- f. Evaluation of pre- and post-knowledge of lean meat cuts, portion size, cooking methods, the use of beef in combination dishes and the effect of this proposed cooperation on public opinion.

The meat industry contribution consisted of:

- a. Meat product and other necessary food ingredients for the taste test.
- b. Funds to pay the food demonstrators conducting the taste testing.
- c. Printed information on composition of lean meat, appropriate portion size and approved cooking methods.
- d. Local publicity for the taste test in cooperation with MHHP.

Another agreement was made between the grocer/meat manager and MHHP to insure quality control. This agreement specified the type of beef and pork to be used in the taste testing and designated the placement of the demonstration in the meat department.

Training was given to meat department managers and food demonstrators. They learned about the role of lean meat in the healthy diet, the fat and cholesterol composition

of meat, low-fat cooking methods, meat cuts appropriate for display with the lean meat label, appropriate portion size and appropriate responses to customer questions regarding the program. Demonstrator training also included procedures for setting up the taste testing and working with the meat manager to facilitate the program in each participating store.

Program Implementation

The program was implemented in three grocery stores in Mankato, Minnesota during three consecutive weekends in the fall of 1984. A similar approach was used in five stores in Fargo/Moorhead, another intervention community of the Minnesota Heart Health Program, during a four-week period in May, 1985. The grocery stores selected for the pilot program represented those stores with meat sales totalling more than \$25,000 per week. In order to acquaint consumers with lean meat as a tasty alternative to fatty meat, taste-testing booths were located in the meat department of each of the participating stores. Recipes for the taste testing included heart healthy beef stew, beef and pork stir fry and a lean pork chop. The taste testing provided an opportunity to overcome consumer perceptions that lean meat is "tough" or less tasty than fatty meat. Recipes and customer information brochures were distributed at the booths. The customer brochures contained lists of lean cuts of meat, appropriate portion size and low-fat cooking methods. "Lean Meats Make the Grade" buttons were worn by grocery store personnel and demonstrators. Labels were used on individual meat packages to clearly identify cuts of meat at the point of purchase. Meat case strips promoted lean cuts of meat at the meat counter. The project was also promoted in the community through advertisements labeled with hearts in the local newspapers and on local radio stations.

Program Evaluation

The evaluation of this project was designed to assess the potential of this program as an effective way to reach large segments of the community. The major endpoints were changes in knowledge of lean meat cuts, knowledge of preparation methods for lean meats and beliefs about the role of meat in a healthy diet. Overall awareness of the program was also assessed, as was the reputation of the Heart Health Program as a provider of reliable nutrition information.

In order to assess the community-wide impact of the program, consumer surveys of population-based samples were selected as the evaluation tool (Rossi et al., 1979). The population-based surveys examine the program's effect on the community as a whole, rather than a more limited sample of only those known to be exposed to the intervention. Telephone surveys were chosen as the best way to collect high-quality data from a large sample quickly and with good response rates (Dillman, 1978).

The evaluation design differed slightly between the communities. The program in Mankato was evaluated by means of a post-program survey, conducted simultaneously in Mankato and in a community of similar size and composition which had not received the program. Telephone surveys in Fargo-Moorhead and in a comparable community were also used but in these communities, the surveys were conducted

with a cohort who was interviewed both before and after the program was introduced.

Households were randomly selected from the telephone directory for participation in the survey. In each household selected for the survey, the interviewer asked to speak to the adult who had responsibility for food shopping and food preparation. As might be expected with such a respondent selection technique, 80% of respondents were women.

Response rates to the telephone survey were 91% in Mankato and 89% in its comparison community. The rate in both Fargo-Moorhead and its comparison community was 94% for the pre-test survey; 90% of the original respondents were resurveyed in the follow-up. Analysis results are presented only for those who completed both surveys.

Demographic differences between the respondents in each of the four communities are shown in Table 1. Mankato respondents were significantly better educated than their comparison community respondents ($p < .01$); Fargo-Moorhead respondents were significantly younger ($p < .01$) and better educated ($p < .01$) than comparison community respondents. Because of these differences, comparisons were examined controlling for age and education.

Awareness

Awareness of the program by respondents is an important variable because it reveals both the size and the characteristics of the audience reached by a given program (Rossi, 1979). However, awareness assessment of this community program is difficult for two reasons: First, because the social desirability of responding "yes" to awareness of a community program generally inflates the awareness measure and; Second, because such programs may be easily confused in the minds of respondents with the efforts of meat producers and grocery stores to label fat content of selected items.

Awareness of the lean meats program was assessed in Mankato and Fargo-Moorhead, with the same questions asked in the comparison communities. These results are shown in Table 2. Although significantly more Mankato and Fargo-Moorhead than comparison respondents ($p < .01$) were aware of a lean meats labeling program in their community, the proportion citing awareness of such a promotion was high in both communities. This high awareness in the comparison communities may reflect the presence of a specific program in that community or respondents may have been thinking of the "percent lean" labels routinely applied to ground beef, as well as the labels now being used by some packagers of luncheon meats and ham.

More discrimination was achieved when respondents were asked whether they knew who was sponsoring the program. Between 32% and 33% of respondents in the intervention communities thought they knew, compared to about 8% to 9% in the comparison communities.

Finally, 19% and 22% of respondents in Mankato and Fargo-Moorhead respectively were able to name the Heart Health Program as a sponsor. Only a few named beef or pork producer groups as a sponsor, indicating low awareness that it was a joint program. Comparison community respondents named producer groups, government agencies and the grocery stores as sponsors. Significantly more respondents from program communities claimed to be aware of taste

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents.

	<i>Mankato (N = 201)</i>	<i>Comparison (N = 212)</i>	<i>Fargo-Moorhead (N = 221)</i>	<i>Comparison (N = 202)</i>
Gender				
Male	20%	16%	21%	14%
Female	80%	84%	79%	86%
Age				
25-34	29%	34%	39%	24%
35-44	25%	19%	23%	28%
45-54	18%	19%	16%	16%
55-74	28%	27%	22%	32%
Education				
High School Graduate or less	36%	48%	31%	50%
Some college, business or vocational school	34%	29%	36%	26%
College Graduate or more	30%	23%	33%	25%
Employment				
Professional/Executive	17%	16%	19%	14%
Clerical/Technical	35%	30%	38%	32%
Blue Collar/Service	21%	17%	16%	14%
Not Employed	26%	36%	26%	39%
Marital Status				
Married	71%	71%	68%	76%
Divorced or Separated	8%	10%	10%	8%
Widowed	8%	10%	6%	8%
Never Married	13%	8%	15%	8%

Table 2. Awareness of Lean Meats Promotion Program.

	<i>Mankato (N = 201)</i>	<i>Comparison (N = 212)</i>	<i>Fargo-Moorhead (N = 197)</i>	<i>Comparison (N = 183)</i>
% Claiming Awareness	70%	59%	69%	57%
% Knowing Sponsor	32%	9%	33%	8%
% Naming HHP as Sponsor	22%	—	19%	—

Table 3. Slogan Recognition: Lean Meats Make the Grade.

<i>Have you heard of any of these slogans?</i>	<i>Mankato (N = 201)</i>	<i>Comparison (N = 212)</i>	<i>Fargo/Moorhead (N = 197)</i>	<i>Comparison (N = 183)</i>
America is leanin' on pork	67%	58%	34%	36%
Beef gives strength	39%	46%	48%	23%
Get back to basics with beef	48%	44%	56%	44%
Beef is everybody's favorite	29%	33%	38%	28%
Lean meats make the grade	30%	20%	25%	20%

testings of lean meats ($p < .01$), but once again the rate of false recognition was quite high. This finding may also reflect the presence of other taste testing programs sponsored by food retailers.

As a final measure of program awareness, respondents were asked if they recognized several slogans promoting meats. Two of these were real slogans used in national meat promotions ("America Is Leanin' On Pork," and "Beef Gives Strength"); two were bogus slogans ("Get Back To Basics With Beef" and "Beef Is Every Body's Favorite") and one was the slogan used by the lean meats promotion ("Lean Meats Make The Grade"). Results are shown in Table 3. Although the "lean meats" slogan was among the least well-recognized in Mankato, it was significantly better recognized in Mankato than in the comparison community ($p < .01$), indicating significant awareness of the lean meats program. However, the bogus slogans were both better "recognized" than the nationally advertised beef slogan. Finally, significantly more Mankato than comparison community respondents ($p < .01$) recognized the nationally-used pork slogan, for unknown reasons. Interestingly, awareness of the program was about equal at all levels of age and education in the communities.

Taken together, these results indicate that about 20% of respondents in the program communities had a high level of awareness of the program, including knowing the details of its sponsorship; a much larger percentage probably had some level of awareness of the program's presence in their grocery stores. These levels of awareness were achieved in a setting of high levels of community awareness of the Heart Health Program itself (Mittelmark et al., 1986).

Knowledge

As previously mentioned, a major goal of the lean meats program was to improve consumers' knowledge of lean meats and how to prepare them. The items were asked in an agree/disagree format, rather than true/false, to avoid respondent embarrassment and reluctance to continue the survey. All of these items were taken directly from the informational pamphlets distributed in the grocery stores. Items were pilot tested using telephone respondents in the Minneapolis, MN metro area. Reliability of the knowledge scale was .76.

Two knowledge scores, one reflecting participant's knowledge of lean cuts and the second reflecting knowledge of low-fat preparation methods, were developed. The scores were based on the number of items which the participants answered correctly. Knowledge scores were analyzed using analysis of variance, separately controlling for age and education. As shown in Table 4, knowledge of lean cuts improved over time in Fargo-Moorhead; the comparison community also showed improvement. This is probably a testing effect rather than an intervention effect. Scores were significantly higher in Mankato than in its comparison community ($p \leq .001$), suggesting that the program did impact consumer knowledge of lean meat cuts. This difference extended across all levels of age and education.

Knowledge of low-fat preparation methods also improved over time in both Fargo-Moorhead ($p \leq .05$) and Mankato ($p \leq .01$) relative to the comparison community, as shown in

Table 4. Comparison of Knowledge Score for Lean Meat Cuts for the Two Town Pairs (6 points possible).

	Before Program			After Program	
	N	X	(S.D.)	X	(S.D.)
Fargo-Moorhead	197	4.38	(1.11)	4.50	(1.06)
Comparison	183	4.11	(1.14)	4.28	(1.12)
Mankato	201	—	—	4.66	(1.06)*
Comparison	212	—	—	4.21	(1.21)

* $p \leq .001$

Table 5. Comparison of Knowledge Score for Low-fat Preparation Methods for the Two Town Pairs (4 points possible).

	Before Program			After Program	
	N	X	(S.D.)	X	(S.D.)
Fargo-Moorhead	197	3.06	(0.88)	3.27	(0.80)*
Comparison	183	3.04	(0.87)	3.08	(0.90)
Mankato	201	—	—	3.19	(0.81)**
Comparison	212	—	—	2.94	(0.95)

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 5. In both Fargo-Moorhead and Mankato, this improved knowledge was found in people at all levels of age and education.

Knowledge of appropriate meat portion size was not included in these scores because of a different response format. Participant's responses to this item are shown in Table 6. Clearly, knowledge of portion size did not differ among the four communities.

Beliefs

A series of items was constructed to assess consumers' beliefs that lean meats are tasty, easy to prepare, can be incorporated into a low-fat diet and that experts from a variety of disciplines are conveying consistent messages about the need to reduce dietary fat. These questions were also pilot tested with Minneapolis metro area respondents. The reliability of the belief scale was .81.

A series of opinion statements about these topics was used in the telephone survey. The belief scores were analyzed using analysis of variance, as shown in Table 7. Opinions in all three areas corresponded to the goals of the program and did not change as a result of the program. Respondents generally held favorable beliefs about the nutrition messages; no differences could be observed between the towns. In all towns, the least favorable beliefs were held by those over 55 years of age and by those with high school educations or less.

Attitudes

Finally respondents were asked to rate on a 0-to-10 scale how reliable they thought several nutrition information

Table 6. Knowledge of Lean Meat Portion Sizes.

	<i>Time 1</i> <i>(November)</i>		<i>Time 2</i> <i>(June)</i>	
	<i>Fargo-Moorhead</i>	<i>Eau Claire</i>	<i>Fargo-Moorhead</i>	<i>Eau Claire</i>
	<i>(N = 197)</i>	<i>(N = 183)</i>	<i>(N = 197)</i>	<i>(N = 183)</i>
Portion Sizes				
In your opinion, should an average serving of lean meat be three, six, nine, or twelve ounces?				
Three	48%	40%	47%	44%
Six	48%	54%	50%	51%
Nine	2%	4%	2%	3%
Twelve	2%	1%	1%	1%
Don't Know	0%	1%	0%	1%

Table 7. Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance on Belief Scores by City. (Each item was scored on a four-point scale; negative items were reversed and the total for each scale was summed)**A. Belief Score:**

That lean meats have desirable qualities
(20 points possible)

	<i>N</i>	<i>Before Program</i>		<i>After Program</i>	
		<i>X</i>	<i>(S.D.)</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>(S.D.)</i>
Mankato	199	—	—	14.45	(2.49)
Comparison	212	—	—	14.19	(2.77)
Fargo-Moorhead	196	14.78	(2.58)	15.01	(2.58)
Comparison	183	14.81	(2.54)	14.75	(2.78)

B. Belief Score:

That lean meats can be part of a low-fat diet
(8 points possible)

	<i>N</i>	<i>Before Program</i>		<i>After Program</i>	
		<i>X</i>	<i>(S.D.)</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>(S.D.)</i>
Mankato	201	—	—	6.64	(1.21)
Comparison	212	—	—	6.70	(1.15)
Fargo-Moorhead	197	6.78	(1.17)	6.73	(1.11)
Comparison	183	6.77	(1.15)	6.60	(1.40)

C. Belief Score:

That experts are conveying a consistent message
about dietary fat and cholesterol
(16 points possible)

	<i>N</i>	<i>Before Program</i>		<i>After Program</i>	
		<i>X</i>	<i>(S.D.)</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>(S.D.)</i>
Mankato	199	—	—	13.18	(2.53)
Comparison	212	—	—	12.85	(2.31)
Fargo-Moorhead	197	13.13	(2.23)	13.48	(2.19)
Comparison	183	13.09	(2.24)	13.36	(2.22)

Table 8. Attitudes Toward Sources of Nutrition Information.

On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means not at all reliable and 10 means very reliable, how reliable do you think [each source] is as a source of information about nutrition?				
	Mankato (N=201)	Comparison (N=212)	Fargo-Moorhead (N=221)	Comparison (N=202)
State Beef Producers Council (s.e.m.)	7.32 (0.17)	7.16 (0.18)	7.58 (0.16)	7.53 (0.18)
State Agriculture Extension Service (s.e.m.)	7.78 (0.15)	7.75 (0.16)	8.38 (0.13)	8.08 (0.13)
Your doctor (s.e.m.)	6.86 (0.20)	7.28 (0.19)	7.43 (0.18)	7.76 (.17)
Heart Health Program (s.e.m.)	9.18 (0.10)	—	8.74 (0.13)	—
And how likely would you be to ask for nutrition information from [each source]? (% Very Likely)				
	Mankato (N=201)	Comparison (N=212)	Fargo-Moorhead (N=221)	Comparison (N=202)
State Beef Producers Council	11%	10%	11%	9%
State Agriculture Extension Service	15%	19%	19%	19%
Your doctor	36%	43%	43%	50%
Heart Health Program	49%	—	40%	—

sources were. The sources were the State Beef Producers Council, the State Agriculture Extension Service, their doctor, and (in Mankato and Fargo-Moorhead only) the Heart Health Program. Respondents were also asked how likely they would be to ask for nutrition information from each of those sources.

Results of this part of the survey are shown in Table 8. Although all of the named sources were given high ratings for reliability, both demonstration communities gave the highest ratings to the Heart Health Programs. However, Mankato rated the Heart Health Program significantly higher than Fargo-Moorhead did. More Mankato respondents judged themselves "very likely" to ask for nutrition information from the Mankato Heart Health Program than from the Beef Producers or the State Agriculture Extension Service; however, many (36%) sought information from their doctor.

Discussion

This cooperative pilot program represents a first step in the development of health/industry collaboration to better inform consumers. It provided an opportunity for open communication between two previously antagonistic groups in the food sector and resulted in a consistent message to consumers. In addition, meat managers were trained to provide appropriate messages to consumers about lean meats and can continue to provide these messages at the meat counter. We believe that this collaboration has resulted in informing consumers about the role of lean meat in a healthy diet, incorporating both the health perspective and the meat industry's position in a positive way. Participating grocery stores in the first pilot have continued to use the lean meat label in their meat departments. They have purchased these labels with their own funds. In addition, one major grocery chain in the upper midwest had adopted the program under the title "Better

Health with Lean Meats." They used the criteria developed by MHP and funded training programs for all 450 meat managers in their stores. These efforts suggest that the program has been perceived as a positive innovation by the food industry and which can be maintained with funds from the food industry.

Our experience has provided the following insight regarding working with food producer groups:

1. Develop a working relationship based on trust and mutual respect with agricultural producer groups. These groups can provide resources for implementation of such a program as well as a broad-based network within their industry to assure program success.
2. Be knowledgeable about all aspects of the product, both production and marketing. This will facilitate understanding between the groups and also provide the health professional with information about intervening in the entire system to ensure a quality program.
3. Be sure that the criteria for collaboration are stated in writing. Ensure that review procedures involve all parties so that written material reflects the most current information from both the industry and the health promotion group.
4. Inform health professionals in the community. Our group found consumer interest to be strong and positive, whereas there emerged a series of questions from health professionals regarding such a collaborative effort. This collaboration represented a new focus on lean meats and many health professionals were not fully aware of the role of lean meat in

a healthy diet. Therefore, education of health professionals prior to program implementation is critical to the success of such a program.

In order to implement effective nutrition education programs, it is important to collaborate to provide a consistent message for consumers from all segments of the food system.

Summary

This study demonstrated a slightly increased knowledge of lean meat cuts and preparation methods in the communities which received the lean meats program. All the communities held equally favorable beliefs about the scientific acceptability of the eating patterns message. Finally, the Heart Health Programs in both Mankato and Fargo-Moorhead were rated as highly reliable sources of nutrition information from which respondents would be very likely to seek information. If just the self-selected few who might choose to take part in a nutrition education program had participated, rather than samples from whole populations, then these very modest results would hardly be worth notice. However, the fact that this was a population-based sample indicates a modest but more widespread community effect of this program. It is also important that the effects are seen across all levels of age and education and not just in the young and well-educated. More importantly, this program established a positive partnership between a health promotion group and a food pro-

ducer group for disseminating nutrition information to consumers. Broad community awareness of the program and widespread public opinion favoring goals of the program also indicate the potential that programs such as this one have for reaching a wide audience. We believe that when such programs are maintained on a consistent level for a long period of time, they hold significant potential for nutrition education in whole communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Reid Mason, Manager, Minnesota Beef Council and Joanne Randen, Home Economist, Minnesota Pork Producers Council, and the assistance of the Nutrition Staff of the Minnesota Heart Health Program: Linda Hachfeld, Monica Foster, Darlene Lansing, Pat Snyder and Mary Kay Hunt.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Dr. Rebecca M. Mullis, Division of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, 611 Beacon Street Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

1. Supported by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, Grant R01 HL 25523-01 and by Grant T32 HL 07328.
2. Division of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, 611 Beacon Street, SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
3. Co-Investigators centrally involved in the research reported herein are listed separately.

References

- American Heart Association, 1982. Rationale of the Diet-Heart Statement of the American Heart Association: Report of the Nutrition Committee. *Circulation* 65 (4):839A-854A.
- Anderson, J.T.; Foster, N.; Hall, Y.; Jacobs, D.R.; Mojonier, L.; Moss, D.; Blackburn, H. 1979. Scoring Systems of Evaluating Dietary Pattern Effect on Serum Cholesterol. *Preventive Medicine* 8:525-537.
- Blackburn, H.; Luepker, R.V.; Kline, F.G.; Bracht, N.F.; Carlaw, R.W.; Jacobs, D.R.; Mittelmark, M.B.; Stauffer, L.; Taylor, H.L. 1984. The Minnesota Heart Health Program: A Research and Demonstration Project in Cardiovascular Disease Prevention. In J.D. Matarazzo, et al. (Eds.), *Behavioral Health: A Handbook of Health Enhancement and Disease Prevention*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dillman, D.A. 1978. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.
- Mittelmark, M.; Luepker, R.; Jacobs, D.; Bracht, N.; Carlaw, R.; Crow, R.; Finnegan, J.; Grimm, R.; Jeffery, R.; Kline, F.G.; Mullis, R.; Murray, D.; Perry, C.; Pechacek, T.; Pirie, P.; Blackburn, H. 1986. Community-wide Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: Education Strategies of the Minnesota Heart Health Program. *Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 15:1-17.
- Price, D. 1984. *Beef and the Cholesterol Issue*. *Beef* 3:106-114.
- Rossi, P.; Freeman, H.E.; Wright, S.R. 1979. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA.

Discussion

Reid Mason, Minnesota Beef Council: I think I would like to make a few comments, from the perspective of the producer being involved with the health organization, as in the Minnesota Heart Health Program. There are two things that come to mind as I talk to our producers around the state about our collaborative efforts here: One is to avoid risks by staying in bed, but then you can't always be sure; Two, to every problem there is a solution. I remember the day that Becky Mullis came to the Minnesota Beef Council and gave a short presentation seeking research funds from our Council to initiate the Minnesota Heart Health segment of our collaborative effort. I think afterward Becky commented, "I think you could have heard a pin drop because there were not a lot of questions." Producers were very leary or afraid to be

closely tied to Becky Mullis from the beginning, because I think some of our cattlemen thought we were giving in, indicating that we do have a problem with our product. They did not want to face the fact that we do have a problem with saturated fat and, perhaps in the minds of the people, dietary cholesterol. Because of the data that Becky could provide to us and the assistance through the Meat Board in Chicago, we were able to demonstrate to our producers that when you say "4 oz raw, 3 oz cooked, is not a bad idea," in the long run, you can sell more product and that is the key, that is the hook for the producers: That they are able to sell more products in the long run by recommending smaller portions and people will be buying our products more frequently. I am sure Dick Schadt will be addressing that in a second.

I want to make sure that you understand that there are opportunities in your state because you are at the university research level. You are also working for the producers who fund programs at the university through the government or whatever. But you have close ties with cattle and pork producers, so there are opportunities in your state to encourage each of you if you have a chance to assist the producer organizations. We have a very specific and ideal situation here in Minnesota because we have a credible health organization. As Becky said, we were able to convey a consistent message, and that is the most positive thing that I thought happened in this collaboration! Saying the same thing, we were able to sell more products and we retained consumer confidence in our product. We feel our checkoff dollars in Minnesota were spent very well working with Becky Mullis.

Dick Schadt, Vice-President, Red Owl Stores: I feel our relationship with Becky Mullis has been very good from the onset. I'd like to kind of dab over a few things this morning and tell you where we were as an industry when we got into this. Back in 1984, I was invited to speak to the annual Pork Council Conference as one of their guest speakers. The speech I gave that particular year told a whole bunch of producers that they were going to sell less pork in 1985 than they did in 1984 and that this trend would continue for the next 5 or 10 years until we woke up as an industry instead of cooperating with producer, packer, retailer and also the consumer. After my speech, I got together with Joanne Randen of the Pork Council and she said to me, "Great speech that you gave. I think we are on the road to something. I'd like to take a look at lean meat makes great meat markets."

My assistant and I evaluated the program and found it to be a very good program, a very worthwhile program. Then we did a thing that has never been done before as far as I know; we went to the Health Association of Minnesota. The health organization reached Dr. Mullis. That first meeting was a classic. I didn't know she was going to come in her white frock or that she would stay in my office more than 5 minutes.

But after two or three meetings, we got together and would read where such a committee had got together a program that you saw today. Makes no difference. It is the same program. We mentioned earlier that some of the increases that we did help. We went into this program wanting to teach the meat managers what the heart health facts were: To let them know that we were not going to be selling less meat but more meat and how to cook meat, because some years we had a lot of young people join our organization who were taught how to cook meat by meat cutters. So they got quite an education! Beef increased in the first few months of the program some 9%; pork increased some 14%. Over the past two years as an industry, we lost about $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1%. Total sales has enjoyed about $\frac{1}{2}$ % increase in 1986 and in 1987, it looks like a $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1% increase. So about $1\frac{1}{2}$ % increase in total sales over the past two-year period.

How is it working today? Like most programs, we think after two years that it would pretty well dissipate. Well, that's just not the case! We visit stores on a weekly basis. In the last 80 stores that I have checked, there were 70 stores that were fully and actively involved in the program on an ongoing basis. It is a very successful program. The Meat Board, when they saw how successful our program was, put together their own program. "Nutri-Facts" is very similar to our program, which is a little more liberal and doesn't have the training behind it. It took some of our best things. Last year, we introduced microwaveable meats to our program. Dr. Mullis worked with me on that. We did a weekly demonstration at store level and showed them that meat can be microwaved and that type of thing. So our program has done very well. It is in 450 stores. And from what I hear, it is a supremely nutritious program.

EDITOR'S NOTE: We regret that the remarks made by Joanne M. Randen, Minnesota Pork Producers Association, as a member of this panel discussion, were impossible to include due to technical audio-tape transcription difficulties.