

UDC 330.43:338.43

DOI 10.56525/OOGP3463

## ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING CONSUMER PREFERENCE FOR CHICKEN MEAT

**Murat Cankurt, Terrence W Thomas**

North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro, USA

e-mail: mcankurt@ncat.edu, twthomas@ncat.edu

**Abstract.** Chicken meat is widely recognized as a healthy and affordable source of protein and plays an important role in ensuring proper nutrition for many families. Compared with other protein sources such as red meat or fish, chicken meat is generally more economical and accessible, which makes it a strategic food product in the daily diet of the population. Therefore, understanding the characteristics of the chicken meat market and the factors influencing consumer preferences is important for both producers and policymakers. The main objective of this study is to determine the socio-economic factors that influence families' preference for chicken meat and to provide sectoral information that may contribute to the development of the poultry industry. The primary data of the research were collected through a survey conducted in 2,810 households. Logistic regression analysis was applied to identify the variables affecting the probability of chicken meat consumption. The results show that education level, household income, and the number of family members significantly influence chicken meat consumption. In contrast, variables such as gender, age, and the presence of cardiovascular diseases were found not to have a significant effect on chicken meat preference among families.

**Keywords:** chicken meat, consumer preferences, households, socio-economic factors, logistic regression, meat consumption, poultry industry.

### Introduction

Agricultural activities are primarily carried out in order to provide nutrient for people. Since people cannot live without food, nutrients are of vital importance. Healthy nourishment which is quite important in the sense of health and efficiency of people is possible only by taking nourishment at specific level in the sense of type, quality and amount. Taking 75-80 gr protein, a day is enough for people to have balanced nourishment. However, nearly half of this protein (30-35 gr) should be of animal origin protein. Meat and meat products are among the most nutrient-dense foods in the human diet and represent a major source of high-quality animal protein and essential micronutrients, including highly bioavailable iron, zinc and B vitamins (Stadnik, 2024; Sheffield et al., 2024) [1].

Today the level of consumption of animal product is considered as one of the indicators of development level of countries. The reason of this is the importance of animal protein nutrient such as meat, milk, egg in nourishment of people. In developing countries, the structure of animal product consumption changes in parallel with social and economic developments and amount of consumption increases every day (FAO, 2023; Kan and Direk, 2005) [2]. Although there is generally consistency in demand for animal products, the demand structure may change in time; there might be a shift towards rival commodities or substitute goods in current demand. This situation is about cultural level, purchasing power, social level of consumer and development process. As the level of culture and civilization rise and level of income increases, consumption of starchy foods decrease, consumption of protein foods increase.

Meat is necessary source of food for human health for taking adequate amount of protein. However, in recent years, consumption of red meat has been discussed for health reasons. Sociocultural structure, habits and economic conditions are effective in formation of consumption structure and all of these factors influence consumption.

Since before now, the meat has a special place being primary source of protein within the range of food and nutrition of Turkish society. According to researches; the amount of animal protein consumption per person is 19 grams in Turkey (Alpan, 1993; Odabasioğlu *et al.*, 1995; Arpacık, 1999) [3]. According to this value, it is clear that there is deficiency of protein for Turkey. Annual total meat consumption per person is 123 kg in the USA, 91 kg in EU (15) and while the world average is 39 kg, this value is 20 kg in Turkey. The amount of annual chicken meat consumption per person (16.0 kg/year) in Turkey is close to the value of consumption in European Union member nations (16.1 kg/year) yet quite behind the consumption level of USA (44.8 kg/year).

Poultry is important among other branches of stock breeding for providing animal protein in short time and the cheapest way, apart from its superior food content. Deficiency of animal protein which results from population growth rate and decrease of red meat consumption in Turkey could be balanced with the increases in chicken meat production. In this sense, in order to popularize chicken meat consumption; it is quite important to determine consumption habits and apply suitable strategies apart from efforts for increasing the production. Increasing population and life standards made it compulsory to evaluate sources used in nutrition and carry them to more efficient level. These issues should be planned in national and sectorial basis by policy makers and policies should be established (Cankurt *et al.* 2010) [4].

The aim of study is to determine factors which influence chicken meat preference. In this sense, consumer behaviors were analyzed in the sense of chicken meat preference. Determination of factors which are effective in consumption of chicken meat is important for policy-makers, producers, mediators and marketers in order to develop strategies.

A wide range of methods are used in modeling consumption structures (Bellemare and Barrett, 2006). With the help of limited dependent variable models, econometric analysis of demand for food consumption of household in Kahramanmaras was done (Akbay, 2005) [5, 6].

In the study which was carried in Sanliurfa, which is located in the south of Turkey, factors which influence consumption of meat and meat products were determined according to two-stage decision choice modeling (Karlı and Bilgic, 2007). There are many studies which analyze the structure of meat consumption in classical sense (Richardson, 1994; 9. Karakuş *et al.*, 2008). Meat consumption was modeled econometrically as well (Jabarin, 2005; Tosun, 2006; Yen *et al.*, 2008; Gunduz and Bayramoglu, 2011). [7, 8, 9, 10]

Although logistic regression models are used in various fields, it is commonly used in the fields of marketing, sociology, economy, psychology and medicine. There is few numbers of studies which analyze consumption structure of chicken meat with Logistic Regression. There are studies in which dependent variables of various consumption structures are considered as categorical or dummy variable. In a study which is carried out about preference reasons of fast-food restaurant and in determination of factors which affect preference of meat including quality label, logistic regression model was used (Rydell *et al.*, 2008; Sepúlveda *et al.*, 2008) [10].

### Material and method

The main material of study is composed of data collected from survey study which was done cross-sectional in İzmir. Proportional approach was used in determination of number of sample that would represent the main population (Miran, 2003).

$$n = \frac{Np(1-p)}{(N-1)\sigma_{px}^2 + p(1-p)}$$

$n$ - Volume of sample,  $N$ - size of main population;  $\sigma_{\mu}^2$ - Variance<sup>1</sup>;  $p$ - The rate of meat consumers<sup>2</sup>

According to data of population records, total population of İzmir was 3,175,133 (TÜİK, 2007). With the assumption that each household is nearly composed of 4 people, it was assumed that there are 793783 houses. The formula above was used in order to determine sample volume of survey made within the boundaries of İzmir Metropolitan Municipality. The sample size which was obtained with this formula according to 99% confidence interval and 2.5% error margin was determined to be 2660 at least. 2810 surveys were applied in total, 5% of the calculated volume of sample being spare.

In his book titled *Coincidence and Chaos*, theoretical physics professor Davit Ruelle says “considering chances provides us more concrete things instead of leaving them to doubtful coincidence”. As is known, statistical methods are used in order to explain real phenomena in the nature. Methods developed as a result of specific hypotheses are not suitable, efficient and adequate for every case. Analysis method of regression in which causal links are analyzed requires data to be compatible with its nature. Analysis methods to be used are limited in cases where there might be two (0,1) dependent variables. The most common ones are Logistic Regression (=LR), Logit, Probit and Linear Probability Models (Gujarati, 1995). These are also called limited dependent variable models. In this study Logistic Regression was used considering the easiness of interpretation, in order to determine the factors and their amount on chicken meat preference (Cankurt *et al*, 2010; Cankurt, 2003) [4].

Logistic regression has been intensively used especially in recent years. This method is alternative for linear regression analysis due to failure of normality assumption in case of two-class or multi-class discrete variable. Apart from the easiness of usage due to having no limit of assumption, the interest towards this method increased since the model obtained from analysis is very flexible in mathematical sense.

When in linear regression  $Y$  (explained) is defined as indicator variable which has either of two values (0,1), there is no assumption defined in which expected value of error term ( $e_i$ ) related to these will be zero,  $E(e_i) = 0$  and variances are stable and  $Var(e_i) = \sigma_e^2$ . As a result of this, estimations obtained in case of deviation from assumptions would not be the best linear and unbiased estimators. This inadequacy prevents using linear regression in classification analyses (Ozdinc, 1999). Therefore, logistic regression is regarded as a suitable method in cases where other regression methods do not provide necessary assumptions and it is commonly used in classification analyses. Since logistic regression does not require multivariate normal distribution assumption, it provides superiority in such applications.

It is easy to establish and interpret regression model when there are a few independent variables. However, as the number of independent variables included in the model increases it becomes more difficult and complex to establish and analyze the model. As the number of variables added to model increases, estimated standard error would be that much and would be more dependent on observed data set. Therefore, logistic regression is considered as a suitable method where other regression methods do not provide assumptions and becomes one of the methods which is commonly used in classification analyses. Since logistic regression does not require multivariate normal distribution assumption, it provides superiority in such applications. Moreover, it also determines probabilities about class membership.

Like in linear regression analysis, estimations are done depending on specific variable values in logistic regression. However, there are five important differences between these two methods.

- While dependent variable to be estimated in linear regression analysis is continuous, dependent variable in logistic regression analysis is discrete.

<sup>1</sup> This value was accepted as  $2.58 \sigma_p^2 = 0.025$  and calculated as  $\sigma_p^2 = 0.0097$ .

<sup>2</sup> This rate is not known. In such cases, in order to enable sample size as great as possible it is suggested that the value of  $p=0.5$  that would give the greatest value from  $p(1-p)$ . Therefore in determination of sample volume,  $p=0.5$  was taken.

- In linear regression analysis the values of dependent variable is estimated while in logistic regression analysis probability of one of dependent values is estimated.
- While there is a condition that independent variable should have multivariate normal distribution in linear regression analysis, there is no such condition in logistic regression analysis.

As it is seen, Logistic Regression method is preferred due to its advantages and flexibility such as while dependent variable is discrete, independent variable can either be discrete or continuous; the number of parameters in function; there is no limit for independent variable in distribution on probability functions; being more resistant towards assumption failures (Anderson and Blair, 1982).

Assumptions for logistic model are briefly as such:

- $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  values are statistically independent.
- Independent variables ( $X_k$ ) are independent from each other.
- $Y_i \in (0,1)$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$
- $P(Y_i=1/X_i)=P_i$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

There are three basic methods of logistic regression (Tatlıdil, 1996). These are Binary Logistic Regression; Ordinary Logistic Regression and Nominal Logistic Regression. In this study Binary Logistic Regression method will be used.

## FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

In the scope of study first of all data collected from houses through survey form were analyzed. General information and descriptive statistics about household structure and chicken meat preferences were given, then analyses were made.

Some of the variables in logistic model were transformed to categorical variable in order to obtain difference between categories as probability ratios. In this sense, the size of household was divided into four categories; age average of household was divided into three categories; education average of household was divided into five categories. Similarly, income variable was divided into five categories starting from 500 TL which is close to minimum wage to 2500 TL. These categories are compatible with current literature (Ozcicek Dolekoğlu, 2003; Tosun, 2006; Karakus *et al.*, 2008). For variables which represent gender and existence of patients at hospital, dummy variables which have categorical structure were used.

Variables, their categories, explanations for variables and descriptive statistics were given in Table 1.

33% of participants are male; 11% are below 25 years old, 52% are between 25-45 and 37% are above 45 years old. Age distribution is similar with the literature (Karakus *et al.*, 2008). When marital status is analyzed, while the rate of single people is below 1%, 84% of participants are married, the rest of 15% are those whose couple has died, divorced or who lives apart. When educational status of participants is analyzed, the rate of university graduates is 12%. While the rate of those who could not graduate from elementary school is 7%, 43% is graduates of elementary school, 16% is graduates of secondary school and 22% is graduates of high-school. Educational status is parallel with the study carried out in Gaziantep (Karakus *et al.*, 2008). Apart from those who have been interviewed, characteristics of other members of family are also effective in consumption habits. In this sense, the number of households, average of age, average of education, whether there is patient at home was included in evaluation. According to the variable which was formed by taking the average of age of household, 28% of the household are below 25 years old, 51% are between 25-45 and 21% are above 45 years old. When the household are evaluated through average of education, while the rate while the rate of those who are not graduate from elementary school is 15%, 38% are graduates of elementary school, 25% are graduates of secondary school, 12% are graduates of high-school and 10 are graduates of university. It was determined that 2692 household (95.6%) out of 2810 consume chicken meat (Table 1). This value supports previous studies and shows that chicken meat consumption is common in Turkey (Ulas, 2011).

Nearly 5% of the household does not consume chicken meat. Consumption of those who consume chicken meat was determined to be 5.4 kg per household. When non-consumers are

included in the evaluation, the average of chicken meat consumption is 5.1 kg per month. It was calculated that an individual consumes 2.0 kg/month (24,4 kg/year) chicken meat averagely. Although this value is above the average of Turkey (15.3 kg/year/person), it is below the average of developed countries and level of balanced nutrition.

Table 1. Variables used in model and characteristics according to groups

| Variable | Groups     | Explanation                         | Number | %    |
|----------|------------|-------------------------------------|--------|------|
| GENDER   |            | Gender of shopper                   |        |      |
|          | GENDER(0)  | Female                              | 1860   | 66.2 |
|          | GENDER(1)  | Male                                | 950    | 33.8 |
| AGE      |            | Age of shopper                      |        |      |
|          | AGE(0)     | Below 25                            | 312    | 11.1 |
|          | AGE(1)     | Between 25-45                       | 1458   | 51.9 |
|          | AGE(2)     | Above 45                            | 1040   | 37.0 |
| AGEAVE   |            | Age average of household            |        |      |
|          | AGEAVE (0) | Below 25                            | 783    | 27.9 |
|          | AGEAVE (1) | Between 25-45                       | 1441   | 51.3 |
|          | AGEAVE (2) | Above 45                            | 586    | 20.9 |
| EDUCATI  |            | Education of shopper                |        |      |
|          | EDUCATION  | Uneducated                          | 191    | 6.8  |
|          | EDUCATION  | Elementary school                   | 1197   | 42.6 |
|          | EDUCATION  | Secondary school                    | 449    | 16.0 |
|          | EDUCATION  | High-school                         | 627    | 22.3 |
|          | EDUCATION  | University                          | 346    | 12.3 |
| AVEEDU   |            | Average education of household      |        |      |
|          | AVEEDU(0)  | Uneducated                          | 434    | 15.4 |
|          | AVEEDU(1)  | Elementary school                   | 1061   | 37.8 |
|          | AVEEDU(2)  | Secondary school                    | 705    | 25.1 |
|          | AVEEDU(3)  | High-school                         | 342    | 12.2 |
|          | AVEEDU(4)  | University                          | 268    | 9.5  |
| MARITAL  |            | Marital status of shopper           |        |      |
|          | MARITAL(0) | Single                              | 16     | 0.6  |
|          | MARITAL(1) | Married                             | 2366   | 84.2 |
|          | MARITAL(2) | Other                               | 428    | 15.2 |
| H.HOLD   |            | Number of household                 |        |      |
|          | H.HOLD(0)  | 4=>                                 | 2441   | 86.9 |
|          | H.HOLD(1)  | 4<                                  | 369    | 13.1 |
| PATIENT  |            | Existence of cardiovascular patient |        |      |
|          | PATIENT(0) | No                                  | 1700   | 60.5 |
|          | PATIENT(1) | Yes                                 | 1110   | 39.5 |
| INCOME   |            | Monthly income of household         |        |      |
|          | INCOME(0)  | 0-500 TL                            | 1478   | 52.6 |
|          | INCOME(1)  | 501-1000 TL                         | 1020   | 36.3 |
|          | INCOME(2)  | 1001-1500 TL                        | 200    | 7.1  |
|          | INCOME(3)  | 1501-2000 TL                        | 64     | 2.3  |
|          | INCOME(4)  | 2001-2500 TL                        | 48     | 1.7  |
| CMCON    |            | Chicken consumption in the          |        |      |
|          | CMCON(0)   | No                                  | 118    | 4.4  |
|          | CMCON(1)   | Yes                                 | 2692   | 95.6 |

### Chicken Meat Consumption Model

With logistic regression analysis, it was analyzed “whether there is a difference in the sense of chicken meat preferences?”, if so “what is the proportion of difference?”. For this, dummy variable was taken as dependent variable which represents whether household consumes meat or

not. As the factors which influence dependent variable; household income, gender, number of household, average of age in the household, average of education in the household and existence/non-existence of cardiovascular patient were included within analyses. Estimation model which was developed with mentioned variables was given in Table 2.

Table 1. Logistic regression model in chicken meat preference  
Dependent variable (consuming=1 / not-consuming=0)

| <i>Independent Variables</i> | <i>Coefficient</i> |     | <i>Std. error</i> | <i>Wald statistics</i> | <i>Probability Ratio</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| CONSTANT                     | 3.43               | *** | 0.30              | 130.13                 | 30.92                    |
| GENDER(1)                    | 0.23               |     | 0.22              | 1.14                   | 1.25                     |
| INCOME(1)                    | 1.19               | *** | 0.27              | 19.41                  | 3.29                     |
| INCOME(2)                    | 1.59               | *** | 0.61              | 6.70                   | 4.90                     |
| INCOME(3)                    | 0.95               |     | 0.76              | 1.57                   | 2.59                     |
| INCOME(4)                    | 1.53               |     | 1.06              | 2.10                   | 4.63                     |
| H.HOLD NU(1)                 | -0.93              | *** | 0.24              | 14.72                  | 0.39                     |
| PATIENT(1)                   | 0.12               |     | 0.21              | 0.33                   | 1.12                     |
| AVEEDU(1)                    | 0.38               |     | 0.25              | 2.32                   | 1.45                     |
| AVEEDU(2)                    | 0.81               | **  | 0.35              | 5.58                   | 2.25                     |
| AVEEDU(3)                    | 0.16               |     | 0.39              | 0.17                   | 1.17                     |
| AVEEDU(4)                    | -0.31              |     | 0.42              | 0.54                   | 0.73                     |
| AVEAGE(1)                    | -0.20              |     | 0.24              | 0.67                   | 0.82                     |
| AVEAGE(2)                    | -0.36              |     | 0.31              | 1.35                   | 0.70                     |
| R <sup>2</sup>               | 0.22               |     |                   |                        |                          |
| X <sup>2</sup>               | 309.28             |     | (p=0.01)          |                        |                          |

\* Significant for 0.10; \*\*0.05 and \*\*\* 0.01.

Determination coefficient of estimated model is at common level for cross-sectional study ( $R^2=0.22$ ). Significant variables in the model are the number of household, income and average education. As the number of household increase, chicken meat consumption decreases as expected. According to results in the model, according to families which are composed of more than 4 people demand for chicken meat 2.54 times more than families composed of 4 and fewer people. Probability of chicken meat consumption families whose average education is secondary schools graduates is 2.26 times more than base group. As the income group increase so does the demand for chicken meat but this increase loses its significance as the income surpasses 1500 YTL. Compared to first income group, second income group (with income level between 501 and 1000 YTL) has 3.29 times more, third income group has 4.91 times more probability of consuming chicken.

It is an important data whether variables are significant or insignificant statistically in econometrics. Therefore, when we evaluate insignificant variables, contrary to red meat there is no effect of gender in purchasing chicken meat (Cankurt *et al.*, 2010; Karakus *et al.*, 2008). Existence of cholesterol, cardiovascular disease again does not have significant effect on demand for chicken meat, contrary to red meat. This result support expectations and puts forward that chicken meat is an alternative product especially for families which include patients.

## Conclusion

Chicken meat is among the most important food which fulfill animal protein requirement of people. The main material of this study which aims to explain chicken meat demand of consumers is data obtained from 2810 face-to-face interviews carried out in İzmir, one of the most important

city centers in Turkey. In the analysis of data, Logistic Regression Analysis was used. The model was quite important and puts forward expected results in an empirical way.

Analysis results put forwards a case which is quite important in economy. As the income increases, demand for chicken meat which is cheaper compared to its substitutes increases at first, but as the income increases further demand for chicken meat decreases. As the income increases, alternative meat and protein resources which are more expensive are preferred more. The share of medium income group in total population is quite high in most of developed and developing countries. Proper nourishment of this group would be beneficial in medium and long run. Therefore, production and consumption of chicken meat – the protein resource – by majority of population has importance in the sense of policy makers within market due to its being nutritious and cheap.

Chicken meat is commonly produced and consumed in Turkey. Consumption of chicken meat is quite diverse and common since it has low protein content, cholesterol and calorie; due to ease of digestion and health image, its place within Turkish cuisine and most importantly its being cheaper than substitutes.

## REFERENCES

1. Stadnik, J. (2024). Nutritional value of meat and meat products and their role in human health. *Nutrients*, 16(10), 1446.
2. Kan, A., & Direk, M. (2005). Course of red meat prices in Konya Province. *Selçuk University Journal of Agriculture Faculty*, 19(36), 35–40.
3. Odabaşioğlu, F., Kayardı, S., & Yılmaz, O. (1995). Melez sığırlardan elde edilen karkasların kaliteye göre sınıflandırılması. *Hayvancılık Araştırma Dergisi*, 5(1–2), 35–38.
4. Cankurt, M., Miran, B., & Şahin, A. (2010). Determination of factors affecting households' meat consumption in Turkey. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5(10), 1120–1126.
5. Bellemare, M. F., & Barrett, C. B. (2006). An ordered tobit model of market participation: Evidence from Kenya and Ethiopia. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 88(2), 324–337.
6. Akbay, C. (2005). Econometric analysis of households' food consumption demand in Kahramanmaraş. *KSU Journal of Science and Engineering*, 8(1), 114–121.
7. Karlı, B., & Bilgic, A. (2007). Factors affecting meat and meat products consumption quantities in Şanlıurfa Province. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(1), 127–136.
8. Richardson, N. J. (1994). UK consumer perceptions of meat. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 53(2), 281–287.
9. Karakus, K., Aygun, T., Alarslan, E. (2008). Habit of red meat consumption in Gaziantep. *Yuzuncu Yıl University Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 18(2), 113–120.
10. Jabarin, A.S. (2005). Estimation of meat demand system in Jordan: An almost ideal demand system. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 29, 232–238.
11. Gunduz, O., Bayramoglu, Z. (2011). Consumer's willingness to pay for organic chicken meat in Samsun Province of Turkey. *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*, 10, 334–340.
12. Rydell, S. A., Harnack, L. J., Oakes, J. M., Story, M., Jeffery, R. W., & French, S. A. (2008). Why eat at fast-food restaurants: Reported reasons among frequent consumers. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 108(12), 2066–2070.
13. Kochshanova G., Kuatbai I. Modeling economic problems based on elements of linear algebra. *Yessenov Science Journal*. №4 (53) 2025, 145-153.
14. Nuri B. Artificial intelligence in higher education mathematics: state-of-the-art narrative review of teaching, learning, and assessment. *Yessenov Science Journal*. №4 (53) 2025, 154-167.

## ТАУЫҚ ЕТІНЕ ТҰТЫНУШЫЛАРДЫҢ ТАҢДАУЫНА ӘСЕР ЕТЕТІН ФАКТОРЛАРДЫ ЭКОНОМЕТРИКАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ

**Мурат Канкурт, Терренс У. Томас**

Солтүстік Каролина мемлекеттік университеті, Гринсборо, АҚШ

e-mail: mcanhurt@ncat.edu, twthomas@ncat.edu

**Аңдатпа.** Тауық еті кеңінен пайдалы әрі қолжетімді ақуыз көзі ретінде танылған және көптеген отбасылардың дұрыс тамақтануын қамтамасыз етуде маңызды рөл атқарады. Қызыл ет немесе балық сияқты басқа ақуыз көздерімен салыстырғанда, тауық еті әдетте арзанырақ және қолжетімдірек болып келеді. Сондықтан ол халықтың күнделікті тамақтану рационында стратегиялық маңызы бар тағамдық өнім болып саналады.

Сол себепті тауық еті нарығының ерекшеліктерін және тұтынушылардың таңдауына әсер ететін факторларды түсіну өндірушілер үшін де, саясат жасаушылар үшін де маңызды болып табылады.

Бұл зерттеудің негізгі мақсаты – отбасылардың тауық етін таңдауға әсер ететін әлеуметтік-экономикалық факторларды анықтау және құс шаруашылығы саласының дамуына ықпал етуі мүмкін салалық ақпарат ұсыну.

Зерттеудің бастапқы деректері 2810 үй шаруашылығында жүргізілген сауалнама арқылы жиналды. Тауық етін тұтыну ықтималдығына әсер ететін айнымалыларды анықтау үшін логистикалық регрессия талдауы қолданылды.

Зерттеу нәтижелері білім деңгейі, үй шаруашылығының табысы және отбасы мүшелерінің саны тауық етін тұтынуға айтарлықтай әсер ететінін көрсетті. Ал жыныс, жас және жүрек-қан тамырлары ауруларының болуы сияқты айнымалылар отбасылардың тауық етін таңдауына елеулі әсер етпейтіні анықталды.

**Түйін сөздер:** тауық еті, тұтынушылардың таңдауы, үй шаруашылығы, әлеуметтік-экономикалық факторлар, логистикалық регрессия, ет тұтынуы, құс шаруашылығы саласы.

## ЭКОНОМЕТРИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИК, ВЛИЯЮЩИХ НА ПОТРЕБИТЕЛЬСКИЕ ПРЕДПОЧТЕНИЯ КУРИНОГО МЯСА

**Мурат Канкурт, Терренс У. Томас**

Государственный университет Северной Каролины, Гринсборо, США

e-mail: mcanhurt@ncat.edu, twthomas@ncat.edu

**Аннотация.** Куриное мясо широко признано полезным и доступным источником белка и играет важную роль в обеспечении правильного питания многих семей. По сравнению с другими источниками белка, такими как красное мясо или рыба, куриное мясо, как правило, является более экономичным и доступным, что делает его стратегически важным продуктом в ежедневном рационе населения. Поэтому понимание особенностей рынка куриного мяса и факторов, влияющих на потребительские предпочтения, имеет важное значение как для производителей, так и для лиц, принимающих политические решения.

Основной целью данного исследования является определение социально-экономических факторов, влияющих на предпочтение семей в потреблении куриного мяса, а также предоставление отраслевой информации, которая может способствовать развитию птицеводческой отрасли.

Первичные данные исследования были собраны посредством опроса, проведенного в 2810 домохозяйствах. Для выявления переменных, влияющих на вероятность потребления куриного мяса, был применен анализ логистической регрессии.

Результаты исследования показали, что уровень образования, доход домохозяйства и количество членов семьи оказывают значительное влияние на потребление куриного мяса. В то же время такие переменные, как пол, возраст и наличие сердечно-сосудистых заболеваний, не оказывают существенного влияния на предпочтение куриного мяса среди семей.

**Ключевые слова:** куриное мясо, потребительские предпочтения, домашние хозяйства, социально-экономические факторы, логистическая регрессия, потребление мяса, птицеводческая отрасль.