

"goat," and these or other fanciful names should be encouraged on menus and in promotional activities whenever possible. A lesson can be learned from other livestock groups; meat from "baby calves" is known as veal, from pigs, "pork," not "pig meat."

PRODUCT EVALUATIONS

Product evaluations were conducted in Tampa and Jacksonville. Samples of 300 consumers were obtained in major shopping malls in each city. The 600 participants were screened to include those over 18 years of age, those that had eaten some type of barbecue within the past year, and those that had patronized a full-service restaurant at least once in the previous month. After respondents were qualified in the malls, they were taken to the market research firms' mall headquarters, where they were given product samples and interviewed by trained, professional interviewers in a privacy booth.

Barbecued beef was used as a control or benchmark against which the goat meat was compared. Both the goat and the beef were prepared under commercial conditions by a restaurant which specializes in barbecued meats. The beef samples, taken directly from the stock of the restaurant, were from whole bottom rounds which had been cooked at 225°F for ten hours. The goat meat, obtained from ten Spanish breed goat carcasses ranging from 17 to 39 pounds, was cooked for two to eight hours, depending on the thickness of cut. The entire goat carcass was used. After cooking, all samples were deboned, trimmed of exterior gristle and fat, and cut into half-inch cubes. All samples were then stored at 38°F until needed, from two to four days. According

to the manager of the restaurant that prepared the samples, this refrigerated storage period is well within the norm for storage of cooked beef barbecue by many restaurants.

Each person was asked to evaluate one-ounce samples of both the goat and the beef. Samples were identified only by the letters "L" and "T," and the order in which they were presented to participants was rotated to minimize order bias. Respondents were not told what types of meat were being evaluated. Only three respondents insisted upon knowing the types of meat; the remaining 99 percent did not know. The samples were heated to serving temperature in a microwave oven in individual plastic serving cups prior to evaluation. No sauce was used during preparation or serving, but salt was available for respondents' use if desired.

Consumers were asked to rate the goat and beef samples with respect to tenderness, smoked flavor, meat flavor, and juiciness on a five-point semantic differential scale where 3 represented the ideal and 1 and 5 represented defined extremes (Table 3.1). Although both goat and beef were both judged to be slightly too tough and slightly too dry, the mean ratings for tenderness and juiciness for beef were nearer the ideal, and the differences between goat and beef were statistically significant. With respect to smoked flavor, mean ratings indicated that both products needed additional flavor. However, the ratings for goat and beef were statistically different, and the rating for goat was nearer the ideal. Ratings for meat flavor were very similar for both products; mean ratings were very near the ideal, but both were judged to be slightly bland (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Consumer ratings of selected organoleptic attributes of goat and beef

Attribute	Mean Ratings ^a	
	Goat	Beef
Tenderness	2.29	2.45 ^b
Smoked flavor	3.34 ^b	3.71
Meat flavor	3.30	3.26
Juiciness	2.44	2.59 ^b

^aRatings were made on the basis of a five-point semantic differential scale where 3 represented "just right" and the extremes were defined as follows:

Tenderness: 1 = much too tough; 5 = needs to be tougher

Smoked flavor: 1 = much too smoky; 5 = needs much more smoke flavor

Meat flavor: 1 = much too strong; 5 = needs much more meat flavor

Juiciness: 1 = much too dry; 5 = much too juicy

^bPaired t-tests were used to compare mean ratings for goat and beef. Superscripts are placed on mean values nearest the ideal rating of 3 where the differences between ratings for goat and beef were statistically significant at the 0.05 probability level.