

Consumer Perspectives on Meat in the Diet

Kristen McNutt*

Introduction

Much of what I try to do through my business and my editorials is not so much being an advocate for consumers but being more of an intermediary to help academicians and people in industry who are trying to sell foods to consumers to understand them, try to get them to use more common sense and to treat them with the respect that they are due. Another distinction between Kristen and consumer advocates is that I'm more inclined to place more responsibility on consumers when I think it is indeed appropriate. Whereas, I think most advocates generally find solutions which put more government restrictions on the industry. Perhaps my politics gets a little bit involved in my business.

The Issues

Let me give you an overview of what I would like to do in this presentation. First, I want to present some data that actually belongs to Dr. Sheila Courington, who is Director of Marketing Research for the Meat Board. Sheila presented these data at a press conference about a month ago, and I thought they would be very appropriate and I appreciate her sharing them with me, so that I can share them with you. Then, I'm going to talk about the consumer's perception of meat as it comes through consumer magazines. Finally, I am going to try to give a bit of strategic advice and make some suggestions about the implications for what I'm calling the meat community, based on what we are hearing about consumer perception.

My objective for this presentation is to help you understand why consumers believe the way they do about meat. Let's start with Sheila's data. A very interesting methodology was used on this pulse study, which I think is a relatively new market research program of the Meat Board. The study consists of three parts: the first part is called "Top of Mind Concern," which includes unaided, unprompted responses. Consumers were asked what they think about specific topics. The second part involves prompting the respondent to say, "What do you think about food safety?" "What do you think about health?" The third part is related to these issues, specifically for meat.

The issues that are being traced as part of the pulse study are health and nutrition, food safety, environmental issues,

biotechnology and animal welfare. The survey compared responses in June 1990 to the last quarter of 1990.

The first question in the survey was an open-ended question. I think the important thing about this survey question which distinguishes it from the data base most often used in nutrition, such as the Food Marketing Institute data, the Rodell Trends Study and the FDA study, is that all of the basic studies we use in nutrition education and consumer affairs are related to foods and nutrition. When Sheila asked consumers, "What are your concerns in general?," nutrition was not there.

If you take nothing home from Kristen McNutt's 30 minutes on this program, remember this: meat may be the most important thing in your career. For many of you from the industry, it's your living, it's your business. For those of you in the academic community, meat may be the basis for securing a research grant. Certainly meat is very important to each of you. But my neighbors, when they wake up in the morning, don't have this first thought of, "Gee, what do I think about meat today." When they think about meat is probably when they are going to the grocery store. How much they think about meat I'm not sure, but they are probably trying to get home before the ice cream melts. The other time they probably think about meat is when they try to plan what they are going to serve. My mother died recently and I went through some of her old, old notes where she had literally planned a week's menu. I don't believe anybody does that today. What we do in our home is open the freezer and the pantry cabinets, and what is frozen or can come out of a can is what goes on the table. I think less about meat than most consumers, but I think those situations previously mentioned are the primary times consumers think about meat. Meat, therefore, is not that much a "top of mind issue".

Let's consider an overview of Sheila's results of consumer's concerns. Health concerns are relatively small. The only thing becoming significant in the health area is the fat and cholesterol issue. The leading concerns in the area of food safety issues were processing additives and packaging additives. In the fourth quarter of 1990, handling issues had increased dramatically. This makes me think there must have been something that happened specifically related to food safety. Although this is too late to be associated with the Pennsylvania publicity about the meat trucks, it may be a reflection of that issue. In the area of environmental concerns, the numbers indicating consumer interest are relatively low and there was little change during the six-month study period. The animal issue which concerned consumers most in June was: saving the wildlife; and by the fourth quarter, pets had increased into the same range as wildlife; but concern for farm animals was really relatively small. Although the meat industry might be sensitive to the animal

*K. McNutt, President, Consumer Choices Unlimited Inc., 1742 Asbury Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201-3502

Reciprocal Meat Conference Proceedings, Volume 44, 1991.

rights issue, put in the total perspective of all animal issues, these were fairly insignificant in terms of total concern. Farm issues were the least important of all issues in that category.

Now let's compare awareness of issues and concern with issues. There's a pattern that you will see as we go through each topic. Awareness precedes concern. In the health issues area, fat and cholesterol were definitely largest and twice as high as responses on hormones and additives. In the food safety area, hormones and additives became a higher priority within an issue, but showed a precipitous 35% drop in June of the fourth quarter. I'm not sure how we can explain these changes. With regard to the animal welfare issue, hormones were rated high with a 47% concern level. Beef as an environmental issue does not register very high. What I think is very important about the low numbers observed in terms of beef and environmental issues is that beef concerns are not of the same magnitude as other things with consumers. When consumers are asked with no prompting, "What do you think the big issues are in this country?" the environment was the only one related to meat that showed up in the big global picture. However, when consumers are asked specifically about environmental issues as they relate to meat, they don't seem to associate the two. This may provide some useful information for this audience.

Of the four issues researched, the highest in terms of consumer awareness is health. The second priority is safety, the next priority is welfare, and environment is the fourth. Moving from consumer awareness to concern, the responses were lower and some differences exist, but the issues are the same: health, safety, welfare and the environment. The question in terms of whether these issues are going to have enough impact on consumers to cause them to reduce beef consumption shows a similar pattern, health being first.

The last question from Sheila's data was, "If you were given the opportunity to determine how \$25 of your tax money were allocated, how would you spend that money relative to these issues?" The only things that they really would be interested in allocating their own tax dollars toward were food inspection, natural pesticides and insecticides, protecting the natural environment and toxic waste management.

Consumer Magazines

Let's look at what consumer magazines are saying about meat. Part of my business is to write and publish the *Consumer Magazine Digest*. Basically, what I do in the *Consumer Magazine Digest* is summarize what approximately 50 popular magazines are saying about food, nutrition, health and food safety topics. I do not critique them, my promise to my subscribers is that I will let you know what magazines are telling consumers. Hopefully, you will be able to do your job better because you understand consumers better. Obviously, I have a business-based bias about why I think it is really important for academicians, dieticians, health professionals and people in the food industry to monitor what magazines are telling consumers.

I think there are some very important insights that you can get from magazines. Let me give you some data to back this up. *Self* magazine does a survey every month of its readers.

The survey that was published in June 1990 asked the question, "Where do you go first for health information?" Fifty-two percent of them say books and magazines, 32% said doctors along with some other minor sources. The second question was, "Whom do you trust most?" Not surprising, 57% said doctors, but 27% said they trust books and magazines more than their doctors, their pharmacist or their neighbors. I think it is very important to note that the percentage trusting magazines was quite large. These data and results are quite similar to the American Dietetics Association and the International Food Information Committee survey that was released January of last year. They asked, "Where do you go first for nutrition information and who do you trust most?" The numbers were slightly different, but the results are complementary.

Basically, the data that I am now presenting comes from about 54 magazines, not just what I call the health books, such as *Cooking Lite and Eating Well* but the full range of magazines from *Baby Talk* to *Modern Maturity*. We are now including Canadian magazines; four magazines of color, *Ebony*, *Essence*, *Upscale* and *Black Elegance*; and the teen magazines.

Before presenting the data from the magazine survey, let me give you a few pointers in terms of understanding and appreciating the profession of journalism. Coverage in magazines depends upon several different things. I worked at *Good Housekeeping* for three years. Sometimes a research article is picked up from *JAMA*, or the *New England Journal of Medicine*. Generally, the critical factor determining whether magazines will pick up a research article is whether the findings are translatable into something that is "actionable," or something that people can do. The other factor that determines media coverage is competition for space in the magazine or on the airwaves. When we worked at *Good Housekeeping*, we were constantly vying with the beauty pages and the food pages and the quilt pages to see whether or not we were going to get our nutrition stories in. Many times we would have a three-page nutrition story ready and at the last minute, the advertising department wouldn't get as many ad pages as we thought that we were going to have. Therefore, the managing editor would have to cut the editorial pages to balance the advertising. This meant that we had to cut our three-page nutrition article down to a page and a half.

The other thing that I think creates an important distinction is that magazines have more time to do balanced research-type articles. Obviously, I have a pro-magazine bias within the world of journalism, but I think, generally that the meat industry is getting a fairer shake from magazines than from electronic media (radio and television) and from newspapers. As you rethink your perception of how meat is covered by the media, coverage can be divided into these two camps; see if you don't agree with me when you think about it. It's not that journalists with magazines are more noble or that they are more pro-meat or that they are being bought off by advertisers, it's simply that they have more time to research and write. Another distinction is that magazines get renewals and keep their subscriptions up if they help their readers. That's why people renew magazines. The reasons people read newspapers and watch television is they are buying the "sizzle." They expect the "hot story" and that's what newspa-

pers and television are supposed to do. As a consequence, there is a real difference among media sources. This information becomes important as you try to develop a media strategy.

The first job I did in preparing this presentation was to summarize the data file of the "Digest" for the first six months of this year which covers approximately 1,250 articles from 54 magazines. However, there are some limitations to this data base. One is that it's hard to categorize articles by content. When journalists write an article, they will weave many topics into the same article. The other thing that makes data analysis difficult is that I have only recently started tracking environmental issues very seriously. The third thing to influence information is that there is no weighting between long articles and short articles. As you try to assess consumer reaction of what they're reading, keep in mind that, generally, most people read short, 50 word drop-in articles more than the long articles. On the other hand, people who are most concerned get their information from the longer article.

How popular is meat as a topic in magazines? Sixty of the 1,200 articles or about 5% were related to what I call the "Meat Group." "Fast and Lean" is becoming more popular now and that's driven by McLean, Light and Crispy, and those types of products. Most pork articles were actually about lean pork and how it has changed. As we move from the product category to issues, three magazines picked up the Harvard Nurses' Study, which showed a correlation between colon cancer and meat consumption. One magazine picked up the Physician's Committee on Responsible Medicine report that is in the June issue of *Longevity*.

Five articles from the 60 were on vegetarian diets. The *Atlantic* has a six-page article on vegetarian diets in the June issue. When I see a vegetarian article in *Sassy* or *Seventeen*, I say, "ho-hum." When you see a vegetarian article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, that has quite different implications for this industry. It's a very positive article talking about the importance of iron in the diet and the fact that vegetarians do not get enough iron. Although the article was not written by the Meat Board PR department, the influence of the PR department was certainly seen in that article.

In the food safety category, there were 52 articles or about 8% of the total. Two articles on pork were related to trichinosis. This trend may parallel what Sheila is seeing in terms of safe handling issues overlapping with nutritional disease issues. Sheila is seeing equal concerns regarding processing chemicals and production chemicals; I see something a bit different from magazines. To me, there has been a shift in food safety concerns from processed foods to fresh foods. I think this is partly because of Alar in apples and other things. My assessment is that consumers are saying "fresh is healthy but not safe," while "processed is safe but not healthy." This represents a major change. Meat is generally considered fresh along with vegetables, fruits, and milk.

Let's now consider heart health and cancer. Eighty-four articles were found in this area, with fiber getting to be a bit "old hat" this quarter. The number of articles on fiber is going down, because it's not exciting. Hypertension is being driven by one article, a research paper out of Johns Hopkins University and Medical School on aggressive behavior. My scientist friends don't like to talk about it, but magazines are

talking about a paper reported at the American Heart Association meeting. This study suggests that an aggressive personality is as much of a risk factor as what you eat. This information is novel and you can see why it makes news.

What I think is interesting and what you should watch are women's issues. Women's issues are going to impact nutrition. Pat Schroder on Capitol Hill has questioned lack of NIH research on women's diseases. I think it's quite possible that we are going to get a backlash from women who are going to say, "Forget it, don't give me dietary advice based on middle aged, overweight, hyperlipidemic men." This issue is going to come across not as a health issue but as a women's rights issue. Women are saying that they are sick and tired of not having adequate funding for women's diseases. Their contention is that they will not accept research based on men as being the basis of advice for women. If attention isn't given to this issue, it could catch the whole meat industry blind.

The next category is brand and food guides. The two previous speakers both said that it is impossible for consumers to know how much fat and how much saturated fat is in foods. What magazines do is to send researchers to the grocery store to prepare brand guides and then they publish full pages, comparing by brand name calories, fat, cholesterol, and sodium in several products. These would be fantastic teaching aids for people in academics, except that they become nervous about using brand names in comparisons. Journalists aren't bothered at all by these brand name comparisons. Meat products are doing very well because lean meat and lean pork are appearing in nutrition guides which are summaries of the nutritional value of various products.

My take-away point in terms of magazine coverage is that a single, counter-conventional wisdom research report will make news. If something comes out of your lab that's counter to conventional wisdom, then that is potential fodder for media articles. The research may be favorable to meat or it may be unfavorable, journalists usually don't care. Some journalists have a strong personal agenda, but most of them really don't care how their story affects the industry. If it's different, then it's news.

When it comes to the Physician's Committee on Responsible Medicine or the PCRM Report, I think magazines might either completely pass on that story or they might panic. There is a precedent, the dental mercury and dental amalgam story on "Sixty Minutes." Almost every magazine story on this topic was favorable in terms of the safety of mercury and dental amalgam. Two of the magazines did a real smear job on "Sixty Minutes," and criticized television highly for its scare tactics on that issue. The PCRM may be a similar situation.

The greatest challenge for the meat community, however, is in the environmental arena. Sheila's data indicate that the environment is a small issue now as it relates to beef, but it is one of the top four issues for consumers. The "steam roller" is moving on the environment issue and that is where the consumer is headed. I would urge meat processors to get in "sync" and be cooperative and figure out the environmental strengths and environmental pluses that you have about meat. My sense is that the meat community is fighting the environmental movement tooth and nail. I'm old enough to remember 15 years ago when the meat community fought the dietary recommendations, the health experts and the

dietary guidelines. Then, finally I'm pleased to say, this industry turned around and as I've heard said several times today, the industry strategy changed to "fit, not fight." Learn from what you have done well in the nutritional area and do the same thing in the environmental area because that's where the consumer is going in the future just as much as the consumer was going with nutrition 15 years ago.

Our last overhead describes the change in consumers' perception of foods. Twenty-five years ago, people thought of food as either "good nutritious stuff that tasted horrible and you got it in a health food store" or the other type of fun food, "what your mommy gave you if you were good." Today, food is considered to be nutritious by consumers if it has "good things" in it like protein, iron, and fiber and it doesn't have "bad things" like hormones and additives. I think the determinant for people in the future will be, "What should I eat?" rather than just "what's healthy?" What I should eat in the future has a third circle which is called "good for the earth." We are getting very close to the point where a consumer will choose, if given a choice, an environmentally sensitive product over one that is low in fat. What consumers want is food that meets both criteria.

Conclusion

Let me end with two action items for you and two pieces of

advice. The first action item is: get in "sync" with the environmental movement; the second action item is to learn to work with responsible journalists. They are trusted by consumers and have tremendous circulation.

The two pieces of advice would be, if you fight the Physicians Committee on Responsible Medicine recommendations, then you make that a news story. Don't blame them, because what the media likes to print is a fight and nothing looks better than, "the big money of the meat industry picking on these poor wonderful environmental doctors." If the meat industry goes out and gives them a fight, then the PCRM report is going to stay alive in the media just as long as you fight. The industry should bite its tongue and let other people respond, but basically stay away from the issue. The second piece of advice also has to do with fighting. I think if you fight the USDA pyramid, then you are going to lose a lot of equity that the meat community has with health professionals. For over 15 years, this community has invested a great deal of time, resources and research funding in developing a very good relationship with the health professional community. That has dollar value and research grant potential. If you fight the Nutrition Pyramid, then you are going to hurt some of your best friends in the Department of Agriculture and you are going to hurt yourself in terms of the loss in credibility that you will suffer. You are throwing down the drain 15 years of good relationships that you have built. Thank you.

Discussion

K. Heaton: My question is for Dr. McNutt. Based on the fact that *Teen Magazine* has been emphasizing a vegetarian diet and that television advertising is now geared more toward the younger children and young people, how can we best express our concerns about vegetarian diets? What can we do as the beef and red meat industry to help these kids understand that meat is still an essential part of the diet?

K. McNutt: I'm not certain that advertising is targeted more toward young people. Perhaps health education is focusing on young people, but basically your marketing message is targeted to the group that you might most likely sell the product to. Thus, your message is different depending on your target group. I think your concern is: How do we present the value of meat vs. the vegetarian diet to young people? An editorial in *Food Engineering* magazine about two years ago first suggested that the meat industry listen to their critics. When I'm talking to someone and say something that I know that they disagree with, they may stop listening to what I have to say. They may be just waiting for me to take a breath so that they can tell me how wrong I am. I think as we listen to others' concerns, even though they might not be scientifically correct, we should keep eye contact, keep listening and try to understand that those people have sincere beliefs. Acknowledging their beliefs doesn't commit you to believe what they believe, but it might set up an environment where they know you are really listening to them instead of preparing to argue with them. I think we need to let them tell us about their vegetarian diet rather than telling them, "Gee, you're not going to get enough iron if you don't eat meat." If you present

advice in the context of "if you are planning a vegetarian diet, let me help you in order to get sufficient iron in your diet." By helping someone understand a vegetarian diet, then they might be more receptive to the idea that maybe a little bit of meat might be a good way to get some iron into their diet and that maybe substituting the salad with dressing for a hamburger isn't going to help reduce fat. If you let an individual come to that conclusion, they own the idea, whereas if you tell them, then it is always your idea.

S. Smith: You provided us with insight of what a consensus opinion is and after hearing your definition. I'm really wondering how much value you place on a consensus opinion. Is that really meaningful when it is just the best thing that you can agree on?

R. Mullis: I think it is. I didn't mean to devalue our consensus because we have to have some consensus, otherwise we have no policy. That is true in your industry and it is true in giving dietary advice. A consensus doesn't mean that those scientists who sit on dietary committees agree on every point. It means that for the main themes that are published as part of a policy statement, that we do agree and that we are willing to defend that policy statement. It's also important to recognize that any scientist who sits on the Dietary Guidelines Committee of the American Heart Association is subject to a lot of criticism, so you must have a pretty thick skin, realizing that someone from the scientific community is going to take pot-shots at you because that's the nature of science. Science is always growing and changing and these documents are in evolution. They are the best that

we know at the present, trying to represent mainstream science, and not some science that may become mainstream in the future. There may be one or two papers in the area that look promising. For example, prevention of weight gain now looks like a promising perspective for the future and it's something that we can intuitively recognize as an important step for scientific investigation, but there are not enough good papers for us to justify that as a total dietary approach at this point in time. We look at advice across the board with the perspective of the "nows." So, I think you have to recognize that developing advice is like trying to serve several masters at the same time. You can see this in your industry, I'm sure, when you serve on consensus committees and you publish new committee reports.

E. Hentges: Following up on items that have consensus and a growing body of data, let me ask you to respond to the diet and cancer issue. I believe that in the future that we are going to see more cause and effect studies than epidemiological studies relating meat, animal fat and animal products to site-specific cancers. I would like you to respond to that from a consumer standpoint. Do you think this is an issue?

Mullis: First of all, I'm not a cancer epidemiologist, although I do follow this area as a peripheral issue to cardiovascular disease. I think we are at a point scientifically with cancer epidemiology, and certainly cancer epidemiology as it relates to nutrition, where we were with cardiovascular disease and nutrition about 15 years ago. I think we need considerably more research in a variety of areas that are related to nutrition and cancer simply because cancer is many diseases, it is not one disease. We are receiving more specific information about diet and cancer and I think one of the issues that Kristen alluded to is certainly going to be in the forefront in the future, and that is fat and breast cancer and women's issues. We know very little about diet-related disease because there has been little research funding for women's health issues; however, I think that's going to change. As we see more information emerging, it may be that meat is a marker of some type for the cancer epidemiologist. I don't know, but it may be that fruits and vegetables are also markers. These are some of the things that I hear the cancer epidemiologists discussing, so I think that is also an issue in evolution.

S. McNutt: Eric, I think that we face a dilemma both as scientists, educators and public policy-makers. The question as to how much do we bring consumers into evolving scientific information can be argued either way. There is a valid argument that consumer tax dollars are paying most the salaries in this room and I expect this involves academics one way or another. Consumers pay for much of the scientific knowledge that we gain and they have a right to know. On the other hand, I think that what they also have a right to, and that we haven't given them, is the ability to help them interpret scientific knowledge. That is why I earnestly try to get the scientist to learn to work cooperatively with journalists. When Caroline O'Neil and I were in Atlanta, she commented that what we really need from the scientific community in the food safety area is some sort of a relative risk number. Those in the media need a number on a scale of 1 to 10, when something breaks, so that we know how dangerous it is or how important it is. I'm not sure if it would be a single number, but journalists and scientists should try to sit down and come

up with some sort of weighting factor. There are good journalists who will cooperate with us to help us put these things into perspective. If we are 15 years ahead with cancer research than with heart disease research, I think consumers need to know this because they pay for that knowledge.

W. Schwartz: Kristen, you heard Marty Marchello ask you a question about FDA's increased emphasis on labeling. I would be interested in your opinion as to what consumers are saying about labeling issues proposed by FDA and USDA, and some of the words that those of us in the industry either like to use or don't like to use.

McNutt: All of the magazines are just knocking the living daylight out of "natural," "lite" and "no cholesterol." I pick up an average of six to seven articles every month where they are telling consumers that these are meaningless terms. *Cooking Lite* one month ago printed the entire notice explaining the FDA labeling regulations and gave readers the address to write to with their comments. My concern is what is going on with nutrition labeling right now. I think there is so much momentum that we are going to end up with a nutrition label that is so complex that even a registered dietician can't understand it. Keysler of FDA was quoted in the May 27 *Newsweek* as saying that he can't understand the label now. If he can't understand it now, I don't know how he will understand what's being proposed. I published a nutrition label in the March issue of *Food Engineering* that I would like to see tested in the projects and WIC clinics of Chicago. It has seven items with no units on it. Consumers might be able to understand that label, and for people who want more information, they have enough social educational savvy to go out and find it. I think we've just gone "bonkers" on the nutrition label.

Not long ago, I had a graduate student come to me after speaking when we were talking about nutritional labeling. She said, "I'm afraid that we have reached the point where we subconsciously want to make that label so important and so difficult that consumers can't understand it by themselves, so that they have to come to those of us who are trained in nutrition so that we'll be important." That is why we keep putting pressure on the FDA to make it complicated and include everything we want.

R. Kauffman: This is for Dr. McNutt. I think that this body is basically education-oriented. They believe in the truth and they like to expose it. I suspect that I misinterpreted you when you said that we should keep our mouth shut and that we should agree with what we read and see. Concerning the pyramid you talked about, should we leave well enough alone? Is that what you are saying? I would like to have you and the other speaker address that because I really would like to know what you are telling us about keeping our mouth shut. I gather that you are saying "Ignore the truth and not expose it because we might do more harm than good."

McNutt: The advice that I'm giving you now has to do with public relations and understanding the media and publicity. My point on the Physicians' Committee is that there are a lot of other groups, other than the meat industry, who see problems with the Physicians Committee report. *Newsweek*, the May 27th edition, had a wonderful exposé of what was going on in the committee. The meat industry and the meat community does not have to go out and tell that story because someone else will tell the story. If you attack the

Physicians Committee report, then it may be interpreted by the media as big money (I think someone is disagreeing with me) and strong muscle on the USDA and that something dirty is going on. You, however, have a valid criticism. You have some real problems with the Physicians Committee report, but I think it would be smarter from a publicity point of view not to get yourself in a position where you are depicted as Goliath trying to squash little David. If no one else rises to make your point known, then something may have to be considered.

In terms of the food pyramid, my reason for recommending that you cooperate is that I think you have a strong ally with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and you are shooting them in the back by offering criticism. I think that the best friend that the meat industry has in the whole nutrition education community is within the USDA. If you yank the rugs out from underneath them, you can guess where the labeling issue will go. Leadership and nutrition education is going to go to people who are not as sympathetic to this industry as has been the USDA. I think the department, the American Dietetics Association and several nutrition researchers have seen a lot of work that's going into the pyramid thus far. Several people have invested in this program and I think those people have been friends with the meat industry. I think

you again will be hurting some of your friends. Do it if you want to, but realize that if you go after the pyramid, you're hurting your friends, friends who have been good.

Mullis: I think on the concept of the pyramid, I will say a couple of things; one, that I agree with what Kristen said. If you read the pyramid the way it is presently written, it advises two to three servings of meat. Not the two that have been proposed by the American Heart Association as well as the Dietary Guidelines Committee. The other things that I hear from my friends who are health professionals is exactly what Kristen has said: That they perceive that the USDA is run by the meat industry and has no business in leadership for dietary guidelines. I have heard that scenario from several others and I agree, because you are shooting yourself in the foot if you propose labeling as an educational tool. It is really jeopardizing the U.S. Department of Agriculture's ability to take a lead role in nutritional education, and jeopardizing your credibility with health professionals with whom you have worked very, very hard as an industry.

Hentges: I would like to thank our speakers for their time and for sharing their expertise with us on diet-health issues. I would also like to thank the audience for letting us run over on our allotted time and participating in this session.