

New Jersey Citizens Oppose Veal Production Practices According to Zogby Poll

Methodology

Zogby International conducted interviews of 405 likely voters in the state of New Jersey, chosen at random. All calls were made from Zogby International headquarters in Utica, NY, from Wednesday, April 10, to Thursday, April 11, 2002. The survey's margin of error is +/- 5%. Margins of error are higher in subgroups. Slight weights were applied to party, age, race, and gender to more accurately reflect the voting population. Note: percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number and might not equal 100.

Narrative Summary

4. I am going to read to you two statements. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your own opinion - Statement A or Statement B.

Table 1. How to Treat Animals Raised for Food	
Statement A: Animals raised for food are going to be killed anyway, so it does not matter if they are treated humanely while they are alive.	7
Statement B: Animals raised for food experience pain and suffering. We should do everything we can to make sure that while they are alive, they are treated humanely.	86
Neither	4
Not sure	3

By more than twelve to one, likely voters in New Jersey say animals raised for food should be treated humanely (86%) over those who say it does not matter how they are treated because they are going to be killed anyway (7%). Four percent of respondents do not agree with either statement and 3% are not sure.

Four in five or more of every sub-group agree that we need to treat animals raised for food in a humane manner. Among the races, African Americans (91%) are slightly more likely than whites (85%) to agree and voters over 65 (90%) are more likely the other age groups to agree.

Women (93%) are much more likely than men (78%) to agree that animals raised for food need to be treated humanely and respondents earning between \$15,000 and \$35,000 are the most likely among the income levels to agree with this statement.

5 - 6. For each of the following, do you find it completely acceptable, somewhat acceptable, somewhat unacceptable, or completely unacceptable. . .

Table 2.

	Acceptable*	Unacceptable*	Not sure
To tether and confine calves in crates so tightly that they cannot walk or turn around, in order to prevent their muscles from developing, to produce veal?	12	85	3
To deny calves adequate iron and fiber in their diet in order to produce an anemic condition which creates the pale-colored meat marketed as veal?	14	80	6

***Acceptable combine completely and somewhat acceptable; unacceptable combines completely and somewhat unacceptable.**

More than four in five (85%) voters say it is unacceptable to tether and confine calves in crates so tightly that they cannot walk or turn around, including 64% who say it is completely unacceptable. Just over one in ten (12%) say the practice is acceptable, while 3% are not sure.

A significant majority in all sub-groups find the practice unacceptable, especially among Democrats (89%), respondents living in the north (88%), African Americans (97%), voters between the ages of 30-49 (87%) and 65 and older (90%), and women (94%).

Denying calves adequate iron and fiber in their diet is considered unacceptable to four in five (80%) respondents overall, including 91% of African Americans, 84% of 30-49 year olds, 87% of those earning between \$15,000 and \$35,000, and 89% of women. Fourteen percent have no problem with denying a proper diet and 6% are not sure.