



4309 Amoroso Place
Davis, California 95616

phone/fax: 530 756-7044
foodmarketing@mindspring.com

MUSHROOM COUNCIL FOOD SERVICE PROFITABILITY SURVEY 2002

prepared for
Mushroom Council and Dompe & Associates

by
Shermain Hardesty, Ph.D.
April, 2003

**MUSHROOM COUNCIL
2002 FOOD SERVICE PROFITABILITY SURVEY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | III |
| INTRODUCTION | III |
| RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS..... | III |
| INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVES..... | 1 |
| APPROACH..... | 1 |
| FINDINGS..... | 4 |
| OVERALL MENU PREFERENCES..... | 4 |
| OVERALL APPETIZER PREFERENCES..... | 4 |
| OVERALL ENTRÉE PREFERENCES | 6 |
| APPETIZER PREFERENCES BY CHAIN | 7 |
| APPETIZER PROFITABILITY | 8 |
| ENTRÉE PREFERENCES..... | 9 |
| ENTRÉE PROFITABILITY | 9 |
| MUSHROOM VARIETAL CONSUMPTION | 10 |
| DINING PATTERNS..... | 12 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 12 |

TABLES & APPENDICES

| | |
|---|----|
| TABLE 1, MUSHROOM MENU ITEM PREFERNCES | 15 |
| TABLE 2, REASON FOR APPETIZER ITEM PREFERENCE | 15 |
| TABLE 3, APPETIZER PREFERNCE BY FREQUENCY OF APPETIZER ORDER..... | 16 |
| TABLE 4, APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY AGE..... | 16 |
| TABLE 5, APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY INCOME | 17 |
| TABLE 6, APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY MARITAL STATUS | 18 |
| TABLE 7, APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY RACE | 18 |
| TABLE 8, APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY SEX..... | 19 |
| TABLE 9, REASON FOR ENTRÉE ITEM PREFERENCE..... | 19 |
| TABLE 10, ENTRÉE PREFERNCE BY AGE..... | 20 |
| TABLE 11, ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY INCOME | 21 |
| TABLE 12, ENTRÉE PREFERNCE BY MARITAL STATUS..... | 22 |
| TABLE 13, ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY SEX..... | 22 |
| TABLE 14, ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY SEX..... | 23 |
| TABLE 15, APPETIZER PREFERENCES & PROFITABILITY BY CHAIN..... | 23 |
| TABLE 16, ENTRÉE PREFERENCES & PROFITABILITY BY CHAIN | 24 |
| TABLE 17, WHITE MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN | 25 |
| TABLE 18, PORTABELLA MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN | 25 |
| TABLE 19, SHIITAKE MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN..... | 25 |
| TABLE 20, CRIMINI MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN | 26 |
| TABLE 21, FAVORED MUSHROOM BY CHAIN..... | 26 |

APPENDIX A, INTERVIEW SITE DESCRIPTIONS

APPENDIX B, APPETIZER & ENTRÉE DESCRIPTIONS BY CHAIN

APPENDIX C, RESPONSE FREQUENCIES

APPENDIX D, DEMOGRAPHIC RESPONSE CROSS TABULATIONS BY CHAIN

MUSHROOM COUNCIL

2002 FOOD SERVICE PROFITABILITY SURVEY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The food service sector is an important target market for the Mushroom Council. A profit-based positioning is used in their promotion program for this segment. Casual and family-style restaurants offer significant growth potential for fresh mushroom sales, particularly for white and Portabella mushrooms. The primary objective of this research was to assess the potential profitability of fresh mushrooms for these segments, by determining how much their returns can be enhanced with the addition of new menu items containing mushrooms.

Consumer intercept interviews were conducted to meet this research objective. Regular customers of four chains who are mushroom eaters were interviewed; all four chains were listed in Nations Restaurant News' Top 200 for 2002. Two of the chains were classified as casual, and the two were family-style. Fifty consumers were interviewed onsite at each chain, split equally between two sites. The sites were located in major metropolitan areas across the US.

Mocked-up menus were created for each chain with item descriptions and prices. They listed the chain's four most popular appetizers and entrées, plus a "test" appetizer and entrée that included mushrooms. One chain already had an appetizer with mushrooms among their top four appetizers, while another chain already had an entrée with mushrooms among their top four entrées. Customers were shown the mocked-up menus containing such descriptions for appetizers and entrées, and asked which appetizer and entrée they preferred to order.

Results & Conclusions

Customers of casual and family-style restaurants are attracted to dishes with mushrooms.

- ◆ Overall, 28% of the respondents selected an appetizer with mushrooms and 35% selected an entrée with mushrooms.
- ◆ 10% selected both an appetizer and entrée with mushrooms.
- ◆ 52% selected at least one dish with mushrooms.
- ◆ 55% of those who preferred an appetizer with mushrooms specifically chose the item because they like mushrooms.
- ◆ 24% of those who preferred an entrée with mushrooms specifically chose the item because they like mushrooms.
- ◆ At 2 of the 4 chains, appetizers with mushrooms were the most preferred appetizer (Crab-Stuffed Mushrooms and Mushroom Quesadilla). Appetizers with mushrooms were the third most favored item at the other 2 chains.
- ◆ At 2 of the 4 chains, entrées with mushrooms were the most preferred entrée (Black & Bleu Sirloin and Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta). Entrées with mushrooms were the second-most preferred items at the other two chains.

Offering more than one item with mushrooms does not “cannibalize” customers’ interest in mushrooms. Mushrooms are a broadly accepted ingredient for many customers at casual and family-style chains.

- ◆ At the chain offering 2 appetizers with mushrooms, almost half (46%) of the customers selected one of these items. These items were rated as the most and second-most preferred appetizers (Mushroom Quesadilla and Sautéed Mushrooms) by the chain’s customers.
- ◆ At the chain offering 2 entrées with mushrooms, over half (56%) of the customers selected one of these items. These items were rated as the most and second-most preferred entrées (Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta and Church Street Chicken) by the chain’s customers.
- ◆ Since appetizers being tested with mushrooms were quite popular, they should be incorporated into the highly popular combination appetizer items. Doing so would add diversity to the combination plates, which tend to heavily favor deep-fried items. Because appetizers are usually shared, the incorporation of the mushroom items into the combination appetizers would also enable customers who currently don’t eat mushrooms to try them in a low-risk setting.

Appetizers and entrées with mushrooms are profitable for casual and family-style food service chains, as well as being desirable among their consumers.

- ◆ Appetizers with mushrooms tended to have slightly lower food costs than appetizers without mushrooms. Food cost ratios for appetizers with mushrooms ranged from 20.4% to 29.0% and averaged 26.3%, compared to 27.2% for items without mushrooms.
- ◆ Because of the protein item paired with the entrées with mushrooms, these entrées tended to have higher food costs than entrées without mushrooms. The entrées with mushrooms tended to be more upscale than the entrées actually menued by the chains. Food cost ratios for the entrées with mushrooms ranged from 27.5% to 40.0% and averaged 32.2%, compared to 30.0% for items without mushrooms.
- ◆ A new indicator, **Expected Gross Profit**, was created to measure the combined desirability of a menu item to the chain and to its customers; it is calculated as *menu price* less *food cost* times *the preference rate*. This is a composite measure, intended to reflect the combined desirability of the item—profitability to the chain and preference to the consumer. A highly profitable item is not desirable for a food service operation if few customers are interested in it. Similarly, a low profit item that is extremely popular is not desirable either.
- ◆ Expected Gross Profit for appetizers with mushrooms ranged from \$.74 to \$1.62.
- ◆ An appetizer with mushrooms ranked highest at one chain with regard to its Expected Gross Profit (Crab-stuffed Mushrooms), in second place at one chain and in third place with the other two chains.
- ◆ Expected Gross Profit for entrées with mushrooms ranged from \$1.62 to \$3.01.
- ◆ Entrées with mushrooms ranked highest at two chains with regard to their Expected Gross Profit (Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta and Black & Bleu Sirloin) and in second place at the other two chains (Sirloin Steak with Mushrooms and Black & Bleu Sirloin).

Chains can increase their average ticket size by adding appetizers with mushrooms to their menus.

- ◆ Remarkably, consumers who never or rarely order appetizers were the ones most likely to order an appetizer with mushrooms. 51% of those who never order appetizers and 36% of those rarely order an appetizer selected an appetizer with mushrooms.

Young adults need to be targeted by mushroom promotion activity, to broaden the food service customer base for fresh mushrooms.

- ◆ Older consumers tend to be more likely to order appetizers and entrées with mushrooms. The incidence of ordering an appetizer with mushrooms rose from 15% among 18-29 year olds to 41% among those 60 years old and older. Consumers between the ages of 40 and 49 were most likely to order entrees with mushrooms (42%) and those in the oldest age group (60 and older) were least likely to order entrées with mushrooms (27%).
- ◆ Since preference rates for mushroom appetizers and entrées are low among younger consumers, specific appetizer and entrée items can be developed for younger consumers.
- ◆ Similarly, mushroom promotions can be targeted at younger consumers or food service chains that cater to younger adults.

Less affluent consumers need to be targeted by mushroom promotion activity.

- ◆ Higher income consumers were more likely to order appetizers with mushrooms.
- ◆ The likelihood of ordering an entrée with mushrooms tended to increase with income; it was highest among consumers with household incomes between \$76,000 and \$100,000.
- ◆ Mushroom promotions can be targeted at younger customers of midscale chains.

Mushrooms are a good partner with other ingredients.

- ◆ 41% of the consumers who chose entrées with mushrooms selected the specific item because they liked the ingredients in general.

Consumers are clearly broadening their consumption of mushrooms, particularly Portabellas.

- ◆ Consumers identified the varieties of mushrooms they had ever tried—either at home or at a restaurant. When they did not mention one of the four specific varieties, they were asked if they had ever tried the specific variety.
- ◆ Not surprisingly, white mushrooms had the highest unaided and aided consumption rates—55.5% and 44.0%, respectively.
- ◆ Portabellas had the next highest unaided consumption rate (40.5%), and the aided consumption rate was 38.5%.
- ◆ The unaided and aided consumption rates for Shiitakes were 20% and 25%, respectively. The unaided and aided consumption rates for Criminis dropped off dramatically to 4% and 13%, respectively.
- ◆ While white mushrooms were the most favored variety (54%), Portabellas ranked a strong second with 37% rating them as their most favored variety.

Dining at casual and family-style restaurant chains is a social experience.

- ◆ Customers were most likely to dine as a party of two (57%), and parties of three or more 36% of the respondents. Solo diners represented only 7% of the respondents.

◆ Appetizers extend the socializing experience. More than half of the customers ordered an appetizer at the chain. Forty-six percent stated that they sometimes ordered an appetizer, and sixteen percent always ordered at appetizer. Most (78%) order an appetizer for their group, rather than solely for themselves.

As consumers become more exposed to mushrooms, they may need more innovative menu items with mushrooms.

◆ Chain C's customers were considered the most "sophisticated" mushroom consumers, based on both their unaided consumption rates for the four mushroom varieties and on the broadness of their favorite varieties. Conversely, Chain D's customers can be considered as the least "sophisticated" mushroom consumers. Nevertheless, neither the test mushroom appetizer nor the test mushroom entrée was the most preferred item in either category at Chain C. Mushroom appetizers were desirable items among Chain D's customers despite their lack of mushroom sophistication. Perhaps the test mushroom offerings were not adventuresome enough to entice Chain C's customers, while they were "safe enough" sounding for Chain D's customers to try.

◆ As more customers become familiar with mushrooms, chains need to extend their menu offerings with mushrooms. The Mushroom Council needs to continue to educate chefs about culinary trends and new varieties, and to provide them with new applications and recipes to ensure the growth of mushroom usage in the food service sector.

MUSHROOM COUNCIL 2002 FOOD SERVICE PROFITABILITY SURVEY

INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVES

The food service sector is a large market for fresh mushrooms. Upscale restaurants, which are often food trendsetters, have been particularly instrumental in propelling the consumer acceptance of Portabella mushrooms. They continue to create excitement about mushrooms with new offerings using specialty mushrooms, such as chanterelles, morels and maitakes.

The Mushroom Council has established an effective food service promotion program with a relatively small budget. It involves a profit-based positioning; much of the activity has focused on pizza chains.

Casual and family-style restaurants appear to offer significant growth potential for fresh mushroom sales, particularly for white and Portabella mushrooms. The primary objective of this research was to quantify the potential profitability of fresh mushrooms for these segments, by determining how much their returns can be enhanced with the addition of new menu items containing mushrooms.

Many chains now provide detailed description of dishes on their menus. In this study, customers at family-style and casual chains were provided with mocked-up menus containing such descriptions for appetizers and entrées, and their willingness to order items containing mushrooms was assessed.

APPROACH

Consumer intercept interviews were conducted to meet this research objective. Regular customers of selected chains who are mushroom eaters were targeted. Fifty consumers were interviewed onsite at each of four major restaurant chains. Two sites were selected for each chain, with 25 interviews completed at each chain. The interviews were conducted during peak

lunch and dinner service times while customers were waiting to be seated. Participants were provided with a gift certificate to the chain. Each interview lasted approximately five minutes.

Two of the chains participating in the study were family-style restaurants and the other two were casual restaurants. All four chains are listed in Nations' Restaurant News' Top 200 for 2002. The restaurants were located in the Northwest, Midwest, South and Northeast regions of the US. Descriptions of the participating sites are included as Appendix A.

The participating chains identified their four most popular appetizer and entrée menu items. There was one chain that already had an appetizer containing mushrooms among its top four appetizers, while another participating chain had an entrée containing mushrooms among its top four entrées; these items were included in the mocked-up menus. Descriptions of potential new appetizers and entrées containing mushrooms were developed by Dompe and Associates and provided to the chains. The chains then selected an additional "test" appetizer and entrée from these choices to be included in the mocked-up menus. Most of the descriptions did not specify the type of mushroom. Three of the chains selected a mushroom quesadilla for the appetizer, one also included steak in the quesadilla. The fourth chain chose crab-stuffed mushrooms. For the new entrée, three of the chains selected sirloin steak with mushrooms and blue cheese, while the other chain selected a shrimp and mushroom pasta dish.

The chains provided menu prices and food cost ratios for their four top-selling items, and developed estimates for the test items. The four regular items and the test item were listed on mocked up menus describing the dishes and listing prices. Three of the chains had one appetizer and one entrée that contained mushrooms on their mocked up menus. Chain D had two appetizers with mushrooms on their mocked-up menu, and Chain B had two entrées with mushrooms on their mocked-up menu. Descriptions of the items are included in Appendix B.

The appetizers on the mocked-up menus ranged in price from \$2.99 (Chain D's sautéed mushrooms) to \$9.49 (Chain C's Sampler). Prices for the entrées varied from \$5.59 (Chain C's Cheese Burger) to \$13.49 (Chain A's Black & Bleu Sirloin). The mushroom dishes tended to be the higher-priced menu items. All four chains offered a sampler appetizer.

Restaurant customers who appeared to be between the ages of 18 and 59 were asked to participate in the survey. They were screened to determine if they had dined at the chain at least twice during the last 12 months. They were also screened to determine if they had consumed mushrooms along with a list of four other vegetables (either at home and/or at a restaurant) at least twice during the past 12 months. Qualified customers were invited to participate in the survey and provided with a \$5 gift certificate upon completion of the interview. Surprisingly, only 28% of the individuals approached did not participate in the interviews; they were not frequent chain customers or they did not qualify as mushroom eaters. A few among of the 28% refused to participate although they met the screening criteria. Thus, the respondents' incidence of mushroom consumption (during the past 12 months) exceeded 72%.

Respondents were asked about their appetizer-ordering habits, and then shown the mocked-up menu and asked to "order" dishes from both the appetizer and entrée menus. There were five appetizer choices and five entrée choices. They were given the option of not making a selection. They were also queried about their consumption and preferences for mushroom varieties. These mushroom-oriented questions were placed toward the end of the interview in an effort to not bias the respondents' menu selections. The interviews concluded with standard demographic questions (age, income and marital status). Race and sex were determined by observation.

The responses are summarized in the next section, beginning with the menu preference and profitability analysis; varietal mushroom consumption patterns and appetizer-ordering behavior are also reported. Since the data are categorical, the Chi-Squared test was used to assess the level of statistical significance in the differences between groups. The basic data tabulations are reported in Appendix C.

There were demographic similarities and differences¹ between the chains (Appendix D):

- ◆ The age and sex compositions of the respondents among the four chains were similar.
- ◆ Respondents from Chain C were least likely to be married (46% compared to 63% overall).

¹ Differences in the income and race compositions between chains were significant at the 1% level.

- ◆ Respondents from Chain D were least likely to be from households with annual incomes of \$76,000 or more (18% compared to 36%, overall).
- ◆ The racial mix varied among the chains; 28% of the Chain B respondents were black while none of the Chain D respondents were black. Only four respondents among the 200 total were Asian or Hispanic.

The possible effects of these demographic differences on menu preferences across the chains are discussed in the following section.

FINDINGS

Overall Menu Preferences

Overall, 28% of the respondents selected an appetizer with mushrooms and 35% selected an entrée with mushrooms (Table 1). Ten percent selected both an appetizer and entrée with mushrooms, and 52% selected at least one dish with mushrooms. Thus, less than half (48%) selected only menu items without mushrooms.

Overall Appetizer Preferences

The results reported below pertain only to respondents who chose to order an appetizer. When asked why they selected a particular appetizer, 55% of those who preferred an appetizer with mushrooms specifically stated that they chose the item because they like mushrooms (Table 2). Among those who ordered an appetizer without mushrooms, the most common reason cited for their choice was that they liked the variety (32%--clearly, these individuals were choosing a combination appetizer).

Seventeen percent stated that they never order appetizers at the particular chain and 20% indicated that they rarely order appetizers at the particular chain. Remarkably, these consumers were the ones most likely to order an appetizer with mushrooms (Table 3); 51% of those who never order appetizers and 36% of those who rarely order an appetizer selected an appetizer with

mushrooms (although they had the option to forego appetizers)². Consequently, chains can increase their average ticket size by adding appetizers with mushrooms onto their menus.

Older consumers tended to be more likely to order appetizers with mushrooms (Table 4). The incidence of ordering an appetizer with mushrooms rose from 15% among 18-29 year olds to 41% among those 60 years old and older.

Higher income consumers tended to be more likely to order appetizers with mushrooms (Table 5). Forty-one percent of those with household incomes between \$51,000 and \$75,000 selected appetizers with mushrooms as did 31% of those with household incomes above \$100,000, and 47% of those who declined to state their income chose appetizers with mushrooms.³

Married consumers were more likely to order an appetizer with mushrooms than were single or divorced consumers (35% compared to 18% and 20% for the other two groups, respectively—Table 6).

White consumers were more likely to order an appetizer with mushrooms than were black consumers (30% among whites compared to 17% among blacks--Table 7). Men and women were equally likely to order an appetizer with mushrooms (Table 8).

These various differences in demographic characteristics indicate that there are additional opportunities for targeting specific groups of consumers. For example, since the preference rate for mushroom appetizers is low among younger consumers, specific appetizer items can be developed for younger consumers and/or promotions can be targeted at younger consumers or chains that cater to younger consumers.

² The differences in likelihood of ordering mushroom appetizers given the frequency of ordering appetizers were statistically significant at the 1% level.

³ The differences in likelihood of ordering mushroom appetizers between household income categories were statistically significant at the 1% level.

Overall Entrée Preferences

Overall, 35% of the respondents selected entrées containing mushrooms. The reason most commonly given reason for their choice was that they liked the ingredients in general or that they liked a specific ingredient other than mushrooms (41%--Table 9); 24% specifically stated that they selected a particular entrée because they like mushrooms. Mushrooms were not as compelling as a reason for selecting an entrée as they were with appetizers; nevertheless, they stood out in the customers' mind. Among those who selected an entrée without mushrooms, they were also most likely to select an item because they like the ingredients overall or a specific ingredient. The second most likely reason for selecting a specific entrée was that it sounds good or they have a taste for it (21%).

Consumers between the ages of 40 and 49 were most likely to order entrées with mushrooms (42%) and the oldest age group (60 and older) were least likely to order entrées with mushrooms (27%--Table 10).

The likelihood of ordering an entrée with mushrooms tended to increase with income (Table 11); it was highest among consumers with household incomes between \$76,000 and \$100,00.

There were no significant differences in entrée preferences by marital status (Table 12).

Black consumers were more likely to order an entrée with mushrooms than were white consumers (48% compared to 33%--Table 13).

Unlike with appetizers, men were more likely to order an entrée with mushrooms than were women (43% compared to 28%--Table 14). This may be attributable to the fact that three of the four test entrées included steak.

Appetizer Preferences by Chain

Menu prices for appetizers ranged from \$3.99 for Chain A's Chips & Salsa to \$9.49 for Chain C's Triple Sampler (Table 15). Food cost ratios varied from a low of 18.3% for Chain A's Chips & Salsa to 36.8% for Chain D's U Pick Appetizer Platter. Gross profit was calculated as $(1 - \text{Food Cost Ratio})$; it does not take labor costs or any overhead cost components into account.

Consumers' appetizer preferences are also displayed by chain in Table 15. Combination appetizers were the favored choices at Chains A, C and D; customers like variety in their appetizers as discussed later. Appetizers containing mushrooms were the most preferred appetizer among customers at Chains B (Crab-stuffed Mushrooms) and D (Mushroom Quesadilla--tied with the U Pick Platter, and followed by Sautéed Mushrooms), and rated third-most popular at Chains A and C. The proportion of consumers preferring appetizers with mushrooms ranged from a low of 14% for the Steak & Mushroom Quesadilla at Chain A, to 32% for the popular Crab Stuffed Mushrooms at Chain B.

Overall, 46% of the customers at Chain D preferred appetizers with mushrooms. Two of the appetizers at Chain D included mushrooms—the “test” mushroom quesadilla (tied for the highest preference rate—26%) and sautéed mushrooms (the second most preferred—20%). Chain D was the only chain in the study with two appetizers containing mushrooms. The fact that the first and second most preferred appetizers at Chain D contained mushrooms indicates that mushrooms are a desirable ingredient among Chain D's customers. Also, these results indicate that offering more than one item with mushrooms does not “cannibalize” customers' interest in mushrooms. Mushrooms are broadly accepted by many customers at casual and family-style chains.

Combination appetizers were the most popular in 3 of the 4 chains. Since the appetizers being tested with mushrooms were also quite popular, they should be incorporated into the combination appetizers. Doing so would enhance the variety of the items in the combination appetizers, which tend to heavily favor deep-fried items. This diversity could compel even more customers to order the combination appetizer, and enable customers who don't eat mushrooms to try them in a low-risk setting.

Appetizer Profitability

The food cost ratios for appetizers varied considerably within and across the chains. Chain D's U Pick Appetizer Platter was the least profitable overall (36.8% food cost ratio) while Chain A's Chips & Salsa was the most profitable (18.3% food cost ratio). The (estimated) food cost ratios for appetizers with mushrooms ranged from a high of 29% for Chain A's Steak & Mushroom Quesadilla down to a low of 20.4% for Chain D's Mushroom Quesadilla.

At Chain A, the Steak & Mushroom Quesadilla food cost ratio of 29% rated second highest for the chain, similar to the 27.5% food cost ratio for Crab-Stuffed Mushrooms at Chain B. The Mushroom Quesadilla had the lowest food cost ratio at Chain C (26%), as was the same item at Chain D with a 20.4% food cost ratio.

A new indicator, **Expected Gross Profit**, was created to measure the combined desirability of a menu item to the chain and to its customers. It was calculated as *menu price* less *food cost* times *the preference rate*. This is a composite measure, intended to reflect the combined desirability of the item—profitability to the chain and preference to the consumer. A highly profitable item is not desirable for a food service operation if few customers are interested in it. Similarly, a low profit item that is extremely popular is not desirable either. Values for this measure ranged from a low of \$.35 for Chain C's Potato Skins (relatively profitable but preferred by few customers) to \$2.89 for Chain A's Combo Appetizer (relatively profitable and widely preferred by customers.)

An appetizer with mushrooms ranked highest at one chain with regard to its Expected Gross Profit, in second at one chain and in third place with the other two chains. Since Chain A's Combo Appetizer was overwhelmingly preferred over other appetizers, it also had the highest Expected Gross Profit (\$2.89). The Steak & Mushroom Quesadilla ranked third at \$.74. Chain B's Crab Stuffed Mushrooms had the highest Expected Gross Profit at \$1.62. Chain C's Mushroom Quesadilla rated third highest (\$1.11) for Expected Gross Profit, but the same item at Chain D rated second highest with \$1.03 Expected Gross Profit.

Entrée Preferences

Menu prices for entrées range from \$5.59 for Chain C's Cheeseburger to \$13.49 for Chain A's Black & Bleu Sirloin. Consumers' entrée preferences are displayed by chain in Table 16.

Entrées containing mushrooms had a slightly higher overall preference rate than did appetizers with mushrooms (27.6% compared to 22.4%). They were the most preferred entrées among customers at Chain A (34%--Black & Bleu Sirloin) and Chain B (32%--Shrimp and Mushroom Pasta), and rated second-most popular at Chains C (24%--Sirloin Steak with Mushrooms) and Chain D (24%--Black & Bleu Sirloin).

Overall, Chain B had the highest rate of preference for entrées with mushrooms, where two of the five entrées offered contained mushrooms. Again, this was not by design. The Shrimp and Mushroom Pasta (the most preferred—32%) was the “test” item suggested by the Mushroom Council, while the second most preferred item was Church Street Chicken (24%) which is already one of Chain B's four most popular entrées. The fact that the first and second most preferred entrées at Chain B contained mushrooms indicates that mushrooms are a desirable ingredient among Chain B's customers. Also, these results indicate that offering more than one item with mushrooms does not “cannibalize” customers' interest in mushrooms.

Entrée Profitability

Again, there was considerable variation in the food cost ratios of entrées within and across the chains. The entrées with mushrooms included mushrooms paired with sirloin steak or shrimp; these proteins were most costly than the proteins in the entrées actually menued by the chains. Thus, the mushrooms themselves did not cause the test items to have high food cost ratios.

The food cost ratios ranged from a high of 40.0% for the Black & Bleu Sirloin at Chain A to the 20.0% for Chain C's Cheeseburger. Thus, the Black & Blue Sirloin was Chain A's lowest gross profit item. The Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta and Church St. Chicken at Chain B both had 27.5% food cost ratios—second lowest for the chain. Chain C's Sirloin Steak with Mushrooms rated as the second highest with a 33.8% food cost ratio. The Black & Bleu Sirloin at Chain D had a 32.4% food cost ratios—second lowest for the chain.

Chain B's Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta had the highest Expected Gross Profit (\$3.01) of all entrées. Despite its relatively high food cost ratio, the Black & Bleu Sirloin at Chain A had the highest Expected Gross Profit for the chain (\$2.75). Chain C's Sirloin Steak with Mushrooms ranked second highest for the chain with \$1.85 Expected Gross Profit, as did the Black & Bleu Sirloin at Chain D with \$1.62 Expected Gross Profit.

Mushroom Varietal Consumption

Consumers were asked what varieties of mushrooms they had ever tried—either at home or at a restaurant. When they did not mention one of the four specific varieties, they were asked if they had ever tried the specific variety. Not surprisingly, white mushrooms had the highest unaided and aided consumption rates—55.5% and 44.0%, respectively (see Appendix C). Only one respondent reported that she had never tried white mushrooms. Portabellas had the next highest unaided and aided consumption rates (40.5% and 38.5%, respectively). The unaided and aided consumption rates for Shiitakes were 20% and 25%, respectively. The unaided and aided consumption rates for Criminis dropped off dramatically to 4% and 13%, respectively.

Consumers were not asked about brown mushrooms. Several consumers mentioned Porcinis (7) and Oysters (5). Other mushrooms mentioned were Morels (3), Straw and Chanterelles (2 each) and Enoki and Puffballs (1 each).

Unaided consumption rates for white mushrooms ranged from a low of 36% for Chain B to a high of 76% at Chain D (Table 17). Portabella consumption rates varied from 28% for Chain A to 58% at Chain C (Table 18)⁴. The percentage of consumers who had never tried Portabellas ranged from 12% at Chain B to 34% at Chain D.

Unaided consumption recall of Shiitakes varied from 12% for Chain A's consumers to 28% for Chain C's consumers (Table 19). Conversely, the proportion of consumers who had never tried Shiitakes was lowest at Chain C (40%) and highest at Chain A (66%).

⁴ The differences in white and Portabella mushroom consumption incidence between chains were statistically significant at the 1% level.

Crimini mushrooms had the lowest consumption rate (Table 20). The proportion of consumers who had never tried Criminis varied from 74% at Chain C to 84% at Chain A and Chain D.

Overall, white mushrooms were the most favored mushroom variety (53.5%); the rate varied from 38% for Chain C's customers to 68% for Chain D's customers. Portabellas rated a strong second; 37% of the customers rated them as their most favored mushroom variety. Only 18% of Chain D's customers favored Portabellas, compared to 38% of Chain A's, 44% of Chain C's and 48% of Chain B's customers (Table 21). It is notable that Portabellas were the most preferred mushroom variety at Chain C. Four or fewer customers at each chain identified Criminis and Shiitakes as their favorite mushrooms, two customers at both Chain C and Chain D stated that they like all varieties, and one customer at each of these chains identified another variety as their favorite. Chain C's customers had the most diverse mushroom preferences.

Dining Patterns

In addition to questions about their mushroom preferences, consumers were also asked about their dining patterns. In order to qualify to participate in the survey, they needed to have dined at the particular chain at least twice before during the last 12 months. The largest group of respondents can be considered frequent diners (frequenting the chain 8 or more times during the past year—39%), followed by 2-3 times (30%--Table 22). Chain D diners were most likely to be frequent diners (52%), while Chain B diners were most likely to be infrequent diners (48%).

The respondents were most likely to be in a party of two, followed by a party of three (14%). Large groups (5 or more in a party—16%) were most likely at Chain A (Table 23). A party of one was most common at Chain B (18%).

More than half of the customers tended to order an appetizer at the chain. Forty-six percent stated that they sometimes ordered an appetizer, and sixteen percent always ordered at appetizer. One-fifth rarely did so, and 18% never order an appetizer. Diners at Chain C were most likely to order an appetizer (28% always and 46% sometimes—Table 24), while diners at Chain D were most likely to never order an appetizer (34%). They are most likely to order an appetizer for both themselves and others (78%). Only 5% stated that they usually order an appetizer just for themselves.

CONCLUSIONS

Customers of casual and family-style restaurants are attracted to dishes with mushrooms.

- ◆ Overall, 28% of the respondents selected an appetizer with mushrooms and 35% selected an entrée with mushrooms.
- ◆ 10% selected both an appetizer and entrée with mushrooms.
- ◆ 52% selected at least one dish with mushrooms.
- ◆ 55% of those who preferred an appetizer with mushrooms specifically chose the item because they like mushrooms.
- ◆ 24% of those who preferred an entrée with mushrooms specifically chose the item because they like mushrooms.

- ◆ At 2 of the 4 chains, appetizers with mushrooms were the most preferred appetizer (Crab-Stuffed Mushrooms and Mushroom Quesadilla). Appetizers with mushrooms were the third most favored item at the other 2 chains.
- ◆ At 2 of the 4 chains, entrées with mushrooms were the most preferred entrée (Black & Bleu Sirloin and Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta). Entrées with mushrooms were the second-most preferred items at the other two chains.

Offering more than one item with mushrooms does not “cannibalize” customers’ interest in mushrooms. Mushrooms are a broadly accepted ingredient for many customers at casual and family-style chains.

- ◆ At the chain offering 2 appetizers with mushrooms, almost half (46%) of the customers selected one of these items. These items were rated as the first and second-most preferred appetizers (Mushroom Quesadilla and Sautéed Mushrooms) by the chain’s customers.
- ◆ At the chain offering 2 entrées with mushrooms, over half (56%) of the customers selected one of these items. These items were rated as the first and second-most preferred entrées (Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta and Church Street Chicken) by the chain’s customers.
- ◆ Since the appetizers being tested with mushrooms were quite popular, they should be incorporated into the combination appetizers that are so popular. Doing so would enhance the variety of the items in the combination appetizers, which tend to heavily favor deep-fried items. This diversity could compel even more customers to order the combination appetizer. Because most appetizers are ordered for a group, this would also give customers who don’t eat mushrooms a low-risk opportunity to try them.

Appetizers and entrées with mushrooms are profitable for casual and family-style food service chains, as well as being desirable among their consumers.

- ◆ Appetizers with mushrooms tended to have slightly lower food costs than appetizers without mushrooms. Food cost ratios for appetizers with mushrooms ranged from 20.4% to 29.0% and averaged 26.3%, compared to 27.2% for items without mushrooms.
- ◆ Because of the proteins that they were paired with, entrées with mushrooms tended to have higher food costs than entrées without mushrooms. Food cost ratios for the entrées with mushrooms ranged from 27.5% to 40.0% and averaged 32.2%, compared to 30.0% for items without mushrooms.
- ◆ Expected Gross Profit was calculated by multiplying the menu price less food costs by the customer preference rate. This is a composite measure, intended to reflect the combined desirability of the item—profitability to the chain and preference to the consumer. A highly profitable item is not desirable for a food service operation if few customers are interested in it, nor is a low profit item that is extremely popular.
- ◆ Expected Gross Profit for appetizers with mushrooms ranged from \$.74 to \$1.62.
- ◆ An appetizer with mushrooms ranked highest at one chain with regard to its Expected Gross Profit (Crab-stuffed Mushrooms), in second place at one chain and in third place with the other two chains.
- ◆ Expected Gross Profits for entrées with mushrooms ranged from \$1.62 to \$3.01.

- ◆ Entrées with mushrooms ranked highest at two chains with regard to their Expected Gross Profit (Shrimp & Mushroom Pasta and Black & Bleu Sirloin) and in second place at the other two chains (Sirloin Steak with Mushrooms and Black & Bleu Sirloin).

Chains can increase their average ticket size by adding appetizers with mushrooms to their menus.

- ◆ Remarkably, consumers who never or rarely order appetizers were the ones most likely to order an appetizer with mushrooms. 51% of those who never order appetizers and 36% of those rarely order an appetizer selected an appetizer with mushrooms.

Young adults need to be targeted by mushroom promotion activity, to broaden the food service customer base for fresh mushrooms.

- ◆ Older consumers tend to be more likely to order appetizers and entrées with mushrooms. The incidence of ordering an appetizer with mushrooms rose from 15% among 18-29 year olds to 41% among those 60 years old and older. Consumers between the ages of 40 and 49 were most likely to order entrées with mushrooms (42%) and those in the oldest age group (60 and older) were least likely to order entrées with mushrooms (27%).
- ◆ Since preference rates for mushroom appetizers and entrées are low among younger consumers, specific appetizer and entrée items can be developed for younger consumers.
- ◆ Similarly, mushroom promotions can be targeted at younger consumers or food service chains that cater to younger adults.

Less affluent consumers need to be targeted by mushroom promotion activity.

- ◆ Higher income consumers were more likely to order appetizers with mushrooms.
- ◆ The likelihood of ordering an entrée with mushrooms tended to increase with income; it was highest among consumers with household incomes between \$76,000 and \$100,000.
- ◆ Mushroom promotions can be targeted at younger customers of midscale chains.

Mushrooms are a good partner with other ingredients.

- ◆ 41% of the consumers who chose entrées with mushrooms selected the specific item because they liked the ingredients in general.

Consumers are clearly broadening their consumption of mushrooms, particularly Portabellas.

- ◆ Consumers listed the varieties of mushrooms they had ever tried anywhere. If they did not mention one of four specific varieties, they were asked if they had ever tried it.
- ◆ Not surprisingly, white mushrooms had the highest unaided and aided consumption rates—55.5% and 44.0%, respectively.
- ◆ Portabellas had the next highest unaided consumption rate (40.5%), and the aided consumption rate was 38.5%.
- ◆ The unaided and aided consumption rates for Shiitakes were 20% and 25%, respectively. The unaided and aided consumption rates for Criminis dropped off dramatically to 4% and 13%, respectively.
- ◆ While white mushrooms were the most favored variety (54%), Portabellas ranked a strong second with 37% rating them as their most favored variety.

Dining at casual and family-style restaurant chains is a social experience.

- ◆ Customers were most likely to dine as a party of two (57%), and parties of three or more 36% of the respondents. Solo diners represented only 7% of the respondents.
- ◆ Appetizers extend the socializing experience. More than half of the customers ordered an appetizer at the chain. Forty-six percent stated that they sometimes ordered an appetizer, and sixteen percent always ordered an appetizer. Most (78%) order an appetizer for their group, rather than solely for themselves.

As consumers are exposed to mushroom varieties, they may need more innovative menu items.

- ◆ Chain C's customers were the most "sophisticated" mushroom consumers, based on both their unaided consumption rates for the four mushroom varieties and on the broadness of their favorite mushroom varieties. Conversely, Chain D's customers were the least "sophisticated" mushroom consumers. However, neither the test mushroom appetizer nor the entrée was the most preferred item at Chain C. Mushroom appetizers were favored by Chain D's customers despite their lack of mushroom sophistication. Perhaps the test mushroom offerings were not adventuresome enough to entice Chain C's customers, while they were "safe enough" sounding for Chain D's customers to try.
- ◆ Since more food service customers are becoming familiar with mushrooms, chains need to extend their menu offerings with mushrooms. The Mushroom Council must continue to educate chefs about culinary trends and new varieties, and to provide them with new applications and recipes to ensure growth in mushroom usage in the food service sector.

**TABLE 1
MUSHROOM MENU ITEM PREFERENCES**

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | | Total |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| | | | YES | NO | NO ENTREE | |
| APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | YES | Count | 21 | 30 | 5 | 56 |
| | | % of Total | 10.5% | 15.0% | 2.5% | 28.0% |
| | NO | Count | 47 | 89 | 2 | 138 |
| | | % of Total | 23.5% | 44.5% | 1.0% | 69.0% |
| NO APPETIZER | Count | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | |
| | % of Total | .5% | 2.0% | .5% | 3.0% | |
| Total | Count | 69 | 123 | 8 | 200 | |
| | % of Total | 34.5% | 61.5% | 4.0% | 100.0% | |

**TABLE 2
REASON FOR APPETIZER ITEM PREFERENCE**

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| WHY CHOOSE APPETIZER | SOUNDS GOOD/HAVE TASTE FOR | Count | 7 | 20 | 27 |
| | | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 12.5% | 14.5% | 13.9% |
| | LIKE INGREDIENTS | Count | 1 | 28 | 29 |
| | | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 1.8% | 20.3% | 14.9% |
| | LIKE MUSHROOMS | Count | 31 | | 31 |
| | | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 55.4% | | 16.0% |
| | PRICE | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 1.8% | .7% | 1.0% |
| | LIKE VARIETY | Count | 2 | 44 | 46 |
| | | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 3.6% | 31.9% | 23.7% |
| LOW CALORIE/HEALTHY | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 | |
| | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 5.4% | 2.9% | 3.6% | |
| FAVORITE/USUALLY GET | Count | 2 | 21 | 23 | |
| | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 3.6% | 15.2% | 11.9% | |
| TRIED BEFORE & LIKED | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 1.8% | 1.4% | 1.5% | |
| OTHER | Count | 8 | 18 | 26 | |
| | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 14.3% | 13.0% | 13.4% | |
| Total | Count | 56 | 138 | 194 | |
| | % within APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

TABLE 3
APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY FREQUENCY OF APPETIZER ORDER

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|--|-----------|--|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | ALWAYS | Count % within HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | 2 6.5% | 29 93.5% | 31 100.0% |
| | SOMETIMES | Count % within HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | 21 23.6% | 68 76.4% | 89 100.0% |
| | RARELY | Count % within HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | 15 36.6% | 26 63.4% | 41 100.0% |
| | NEVER | Count % within HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | 18 54.5% | 15 45.5% | 33 100.0% |
| Total | | Count % within HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | 56 28.9% | 138 71.1% | 194 100.0% |

TABLE 4
APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY AGE

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| AGE | UNDER 18 | Count % within AGE | | 1 100.0% | 1 100.0% |
| | 18-29 | Count % within AGE | 6 15.0% | 34 85.0% | 40 100.0% |
| | 30-39 | Count % within AGE | 10 25.0% | 30 75.0% | 40 100.0% |
| | 40-49 | Count % within AGE | 15 29.4% | 36 70.6% | 51 100.0% |
| | 50-59 | Count % within AGE | 16 38.1% | 26 61.9% | 42 100.0% |
| | 60+ | Count % within AGE | 7 41.2% | 10 58.8% | 17 100.0% |
| | REFUSED TO ANSWER | Count % within AGE | 2 66.7% | 1 33.3% | 3 100.0% |
| | Total | | Count % within AGE | 56 28.9% | 138 71.1% |

TABLE 5
APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY INCOME

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME | UNDER \$12,500 | Count | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | \$12,500-\$25,000 | Count | | 8 | 8 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | \$26,000-\$50,000 | Count | 10 | 41 | 51 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 19.6% | 80.4% | 100.0% |
| | \$51,000-\$75,000 | Count | 19 | 27 | 46 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 41.3% | 58.7% | 100.0% |
| \$76,000-\$100,000 | Count | 6 | 24 | 30 | |
| | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 20.0% | 80.0% | 100.0% | |
| \$100,000+ | Count | 13 | 29 | 42 | |
| | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 31.0% | 69.0% | 100.0% | |
| REFUSED TO ANSWER | Count | 8 | 6 | 14 | |
| | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 57.1% | 42.9% | 100.0% | |
| Total | Count | 56 | 138 | 194 | |
| | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 28.9% | 71.1% | 100.0% | |

TABLE 6
APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY MARITAL STATUS

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| MARITAL STATUS | SINGLE | Count | 10 | 45 | 55 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | 18.2% | 81.8% | 100.0% |
| | MARRIED | Count | 44 | 78 | 122 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | 36.1% | 63.9% | 100.0% |
| | DIVORCED/SEPARATED | Count | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | 20.0% | 80.0% | 100.0% |
| | DOMESTIC PARTNER | Count | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | WIDOWED | Count | | 4 | 4 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 56 | 138 | 194 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | 28.9% | 71.1% | 100.0% |

TABLE 7
APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY RACE

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------|----------|---------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| RACE | BLACK | Count | 4 | 18 | 22 |
| | | % within RACE | 18.2% | 81.8% | 100.0% |
| | WHITE | Count | 51 | 117 | 168 |
| | | % within RACE | 30.4% | 69.6% | 100.0% |
| | ASIAN | Count | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within RACE | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | HISPANIC | Count | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within RACE | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 56 | 138 | 194 |
| | | % within RACE | 28.9% | 71.1% | 100.0% |

**TABLE 8
APPETIZER PREFERENCE BY SEX**

| | | | APPETIZER W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------|--------|--------------|--------------------------|-------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| SEX | MALE | Count | 24 | 59 | 83 |
| | | % within SEX | 28.9% | 71.1% | 100.0% |
| | FEMALE | Count | 32 | 79 | 111 |
| | | % within SEX | 28.8% | 71.2% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 56 | 138 | 194 |
| | | % within SEX | 28.9% | 71.1% | 100.0% |

**TABLE 9
REASON FOR ENTRÉE ITEM PREFERENCE**

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| WHY CHOOSE ENTREE | SOUNDS GOOD/HAVE TASTE FOR | Count | 9 | 26 | 35 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 13.0% | 21.1% | 18.2% |
| | LIKE INGREDIENTS | Count | 28 | 39 | 67 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 40.6% | 31.7% | 34.9% |
| | LIKE MUSHROOMS | Count | 17 | | 17 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 24.6% | | 8.9% |
| | PRICE | Count | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | .8% | .5% |
| | FOR VARIETY | Count | | 3 | 3 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | 2.4% | 1.6% |
| | HEALTHY/LOW CALORIE | Count | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 5.8% | 6.5% | 6.3% |
| | USUALLY ORDER/FAVORITE | Count | 1 | 20 | 21 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 1.4% | 16.3% | 10.9% |
| | TRIED IT BEFORE & LIKED | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 1.4% | .8% | 1.0% |
| | OTHER | Count | 9 | 25 | 34 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 13.0% | 20.3% | 17.7% |
| Total | | Count | 69 | 123 | 192 |
| | | % within ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**TABLE 10
ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY AGE**

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| AGE | UNDER 18 | Count | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within AGE | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | 18-29 | Count | 14 | 26 | 40 |
| | | % within AGE | 35.0% | 65.0% | 100.0% |
| | 30-39 | Count | 13 | 27 | 40 |
| | | % within AGE | 32.5% | 67.5% | 100.0% |
| | 40-49 | Count | 22 | 27 | 49 |
| | | % within AGE | 44.9% | 55.1% | 100.0% |
| | 50-59 | Count | 12 | 26 | 38 |
| | | % within AGE | 31.6% | 68.4% | 100.0% |
| | 60+ | Count | 6 | 15 | 21 |
| | | % within AGE | 28.6% | 71.4% | 100.0% |
| | REFUSED TO ANSWER | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within AGE | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 69 | 123 | 192 |
| | | % within AGE | 35.9% | 64.1% | 100.0% |

TABLE 11
ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY INCOME

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME | UNDER \$12,500 | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| | \$12,500-\$25,000 | Count | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 12.5% | 87.5% | 100.0% |
| | \$26,000-\$50,000 | Count | 17 | 35 | 52 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 32.7% | 67.3% | 100.0% |
| | \$51,000-\$75,000 | Count | 15 | 30 | 45 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 33.3% | 66.7% | 100.0% |
| | \$76,000-\$100,000 | Count | 14 | 16 | 30 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 46.7% | 53.3% | 100.0% |
| | \$100,000+ | Count | 16 | 24 | 40 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 40.0% | 60.0% | 100.0% |
| | REFUSED TO ANSWER | Count | 4 | 10 | 14 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 28.6% | 71.4% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 69 | 123 | 192 |
| | | % within HOUSEHOLD INCOME | 35.9% | 64.1% | 100.0% |

TABLE 12
ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY MARITAL STATUS

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| MARITAL STATUS | SINGLE | Count | 15 | 39 | 54 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | 27.8% | 72.2% | 100.0% |
| | MARRIED | Count | 47 | 74 | 121 |
| | | % within MARITAL STATUS | 38.8% | 61.2% | 100.0% |
| | DIVORCED/SEPARATED | Count | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| | % within MARITAL STATUS | 40.0% | 60.0% | 100.0% | |
| DOMESTIC PARTNER | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| | % within MARITAL STATUS | 33.3% | 66.7% | 100.0% | |
| WIDOWED | Count | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| | % within MARITAL STATUS | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% | |
| Total | Count | 69 | 123 | 192 | |
| | % within MARITAL STATUS | 35.9% | 64.1% | 100.0% | |

TABLE 13
ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY RACE

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| RACE | BLACK | Count | 11 | 12 | 23 |
| | | % within RACE | 47.8% | 52.2% | 100.0% |
| | WHITE | Count | 57 | 108 | 165 |
| | | % within RACE | 34.5% | 65.5% | 100.0% |
| | ASIAN | Count | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within RACE | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | HISPANIC | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | % within RACE | 33.3% | 66.7% | 100.0% |
| Total | Count | 69 | 123 | 192 | |
| | % within RACE | 35.9% | 64.1% | 100.0% | |

TABLE 14
ENTRÉE PREFERENCE BY SEX

| | | | ENTREE W/MUSHROOMS | | Total |
|-------|--------|--------------|-----------------------|-------|--------|
| | | | YES | NO | |
| SEX | MALE | Count | 36 | 45 | 81 |
| | | % within SEX | 44.4% | 55.6% | 100.0% |
| | FEMALE | Count | 33 | 78 | 111 |
| | | % within SEX | 29.7% | 70.3% | 100.0% |
| Total | | Count | 69 | 123 | 192 |
| | | % within SEX | 35.9% | 64.1% | 100.0% |

TABLE 15
APPETIZER PREFERENCES & PROFITABILITY BY CHAIN

| CHAIN | ITEM | MENU PRICE | FOOD \$ RATIO | PREFER-RED | EXPECTED GROSS PROFIT |
|-------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| A | THREE CHEESE SHRIMP DIP | \$6.79 | 30.3% | 12.0% | \$.57 |
| A | STEAK&MUSH QUESADILLA* | \$7.49 | 29.0% | 14.0% | \$.74 |
| A | COMBO APPETIZER | \$8.79 | 28.6% | 46.0% | \$2.89 |
| A | SPINACH ARTICHOKE DIP | \$6.79 | 25.8% | 18.0% | \$.91 |
| A | CHIPS & SALSA | \$3.99 | 18.3% | 12.0% | \$.39 |
| B | CRAB STUFFED MUSHROOMS* | \$6.95 | 27.5% | 32.0% | \$1.62 |
| B | SUPER SAMPLER PLATTER | \$7.99 | 27.1% | 24.0% | \$1.40 |
| B | SPINACH CON QUESO | \$5.69 | 25.0% | 10.0% | \$.43 |
| B | SPICY BUFFALO WINGS | \$5.99 | 23.8% | 12.0% | \$.55 |
| B | BRUSCHETTA | \$5.49 | 23.3% | 22.0% | \$.93 |
| C | POTATO SKINS | \$5.99 | 27.7% | 8.0% | \$.35 |
| C | CHICKEN QUESADILLA | \$7.79 | 27.6% | 24.0% | \$1.35 |
| C | TRIPLE SAMPLER | \$9.49 | 27.1% | 30.0% | \$2.08 |
| C | POT OF GOLD | \$8.29 | 26.2% | 12.0% | \$.73 |
| C | MUSHROOM QUESADILLA* | \$7.49 | 26.0% | 20.0% | \$1.11 |
| D | U PICK APPETIZER PLATTER | \$7.59 | 36.8% | 26.0% | \$1.25 |
| D | MOZZARELLA CHEESESTICKS | \$3.99 | 30.5% | 12.0% | \$.33 |
| D | CHEESESTICKS & FRIES | \$2.99 | 29.4% | 14.0% | \$.30 |
| D | SAUTEED MUSHROOMS* | \$2.99 | 28.4% | 20.0% | \$.43 |
| D | MUSHROOM QUESADILLA* | \$4.99 | 20.4% | 26.0% | \$1.03 |

*Indicates an item containing mushrooms.

Bolded data relate to most-preferred or most profitable items.

TABLE 16
ENTRÉE PREFERENCES & PROFITABILITY BY CHAIN

| CHAIN | ITEM | MENU PRICE | FOOD \$ RATIO | PREFER-RED | EXPECTED GROSS PROFIT |
|-------|----------------------------|------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| A | PETITE SIRLOIN | \$10.49 | 39.7% | 30.0% | \$1.90 |
| A | CHICKEN TENDERS | \$9.99 | 28.2% | 12.0% | \$0.86 |
| A | CLUB SANDWICH | \$6.99 | 27.5% | 4.0% | \$0.20 |
| A | FRIED CHICKEN SALAD | \$7.99 | 26.9% | 20.0% | \$1.17 |
| A | BLACK & BLEU SIRLOIN* | \$13.49 | 40.0% | 34.0% | \$2.75 |
| | | | | | |
| B | 3-WAY PLATTER | \$10.99 | 31.9% | 12.0% | \$.90 |
| B | SONORA CHICKEN PASTA | \$9.99 | 29.0% | 22.0% | \$1.56 |
| B | BACON CHEESEBURGER | \$6.99 | 25.7% | 6.0% | \$.31 |
| B | SHRIMP & MUSHROOM PASTA* | \$12.99 | 27.5% | 32.0% | \$3.01 |
| B | CHURCH ST. CHICKEN* | \$10.99 | 27.5% | 24.0% | \$1.91 |
| | | | | | |
| C | TRIPLE FAJITAS | \$12.99 | 35.6% | 32.0% | \$2.68 |
| C | SIRLOIN STEAK | \$10.59 | 31.9% | 14.0% | \$1.01 |
| C | BUFFALO TENDERLOIN PLATTER | \$7.99 | 26.2% | 8.0% | \$.47 |
| C | CHEESE BURGER | \$5.59 | 20.0% | 12.0% | \$.54 |
| C | SIRLOIN STEAK W/MUSHROOMS* | \$11.59 | 33.8% | 24.0% | \$1.85 |
| | | | | | |
| D | FISH & CHIPS | \$8.29 | 33.7% | 14.0% | \$.77 |
| D | PRIME RIB | \$9.99 | 33.0% | 30.0% | \$ 2.01 |
| D | CAPTAIN'S PLATTER | \$9.59 | 32.4% | 14.0% | \$.91 |
| D | COUNTRY FRIED STEAK | \$8.29 | 22.8% | 16.0% | \$1.02 |
| D | BLACK&BLUE SIRLOIN* | \$9.99 | 32.4% | 24.0% | \$1.62 |

*Indicates an item containing mushrooms.

Bolded data relate to most-preferred or most profitable items.

**TABLE 17
WHITE MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| MUSHROOMS TRIED--WHITES | NO | Count | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | % within CHAIN | | 2.0% | | | .5% |
| | YES-UNAIDED | Count | 23 | 18 | 32 | 38 | 111 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 46.0% | 36.0% | 64.0% | 76.0% | 55.5% |
| | YES-AIDED | Count | 27 | 31 | 18 | 12 | 88 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 54.0% | 62.0% | 36.0% | 24.0% | 44.0% |
| Total | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | |
| | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

**TABLE 18
PORTABELLA MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| MUSHROOMS TRIED--PORTS | NO | Count | 12 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 42 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 24.0% | 12.0% | 14.0% | 34.0% | 21.0% |
| | YES-UNAIDED | Count | 14 | 20 | 28 | 19 | 81 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 28.0% | 40.0% | 56.0% | 38.0% | 40.5% |
| | YES-AIDED | Count | 24 | 24 | 15 | 14 | 77 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 48.0% | 48.0% | 30.0% | 28.0% | 38.5% |
| Total | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | |
| | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

**TABLE 19
SHIITAKE MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| MUSHROOMS TRIED--SHIITAKES | NO | Count | 33 | 28 | 20 | 29 | 110 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 66.0% | 56.0% | 40.0% | 58.0% | 55.0% |
| | YES-UNAIDED | Count | 6 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 40 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 12.0% | 20.0% | 28.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% |
| | YES-AIDED | Count | 11 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 50 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 22.0% | 24.0% | 32.0% | 22.0% | 25.0% |
| Total | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | |
| | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

**TABLE 20
CRIMINI MUSHROOM CONSUMPTION BY CHAIN**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| MUSHROOMS TRIED--CRIMINIS | NO | Count | 42 | 45 | 37 | 42 | 166 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 84.0% | 90.0% | 74.0% | 84.0% | 83.0% |
| | YES-UNAIDED | Count | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| | | % within CHAIN | | 4.0% | 4.0% | 8.0% | 4.0% |
| | YES-AIDED | Count | 8 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 26 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 16.0% | 6.0% | 22.0% | 8.0% | 13.0% |
| Total | | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**TABLE 21
FAVORED MUSHROOM BY CHAIN**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| FAVORITE MUSHROOM | NONE | Count | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within CHAIN | | | 2.0% | | .5% |
| | WHITE | Count | 29 | 25 | 19 | 34 | 107 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 58.0% | 50.0% | 38.0% | 68.0% | 53.5% |
| | CRIMINI | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CHAIN | | | 2.0% | 2.0% | 1.0% |
| | PORTABELLA | Count | 19 | 24 | 22 | 9 | 74 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 38.0% | 48.0% | 44.0% | 18.0% | 37.0% |
| | SHIITAKE | Count | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 4.0% | 2.0% | 8.0% | 6.0% | 5.0% |
| | ALL VARIETIES | Count | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| | | % within CHAIN | | | 4.0% | 4.0% | 2.0% |
| | OTHER | Count | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within CHAIN | | | 2.0% | 2.0% | 1.0% |
| Total | | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**TABLE 22
CHAIN FREQUENCY**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| TIMES AT CHAIN PAST YEAR | 2-3 | Count | 11 | 21 | 19 | 9 | 60 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 22.0% | 42.0% | 38.0% | 18.0% | 30.0% |
| | 4-5 | Count | 10 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 33 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 20.0% | 20.0% | 22.0% | 14.0% | 19.0% |
| | 6-7 | Count | 9 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 25 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 18.0% | 4.0% | 12.0% | 16.0% | 12.5% |
| | 8+ | Count | 20 | 17 | 14 | 26 | 77 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 40.0% | 34.0% | 28.0% | 52.0% | 38.5% |
| Total | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | |
| | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

**TABLE 23
SIZE OF PARTY BY CHAIN**

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| # OF PEOPLE IN PARTY | 1 | Count | 2 | 9 | | 4 | 15 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 4.0% | 18.0% | | 8.0% | 7.5% |
| | 2 | Count | 22 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 113 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 44.0% | 60.0% | 62.0% | 60.0% | 56.5% |
| | 3 | Count | 10 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 28 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 20.0% | 8.0% | 16.0% | 12.0% | 14.0% |
| | 4 | Count | 8 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 24 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 16.0% | 8.0% | 10.0% | 14.0% | 12.0% |
| | 5 OR MORE | Count | 8 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 20 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 16.0% | 6.0% | 12.0% | 6.0% | 10.0% |
| Total | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | |
| | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

TABLE 24
FREQUENCY OF APPETIZER ORDER BY CHAIN

| | | | CHAIN | | | | Total |
|--|-----------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | |
| HOW OFTEN ORDER APPETIZER AT CHAIN | ALWAYS | Count | 6 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 31 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 12.0% | 14.0% | 28.0% | 8.0% | 15.5% |
| | SOMETIMES | Count | 28 | 25 | 23 | 16 | 92 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 56.0% | 50.0% | 46.0% | 32.0% | 46.0% |
| | RARELY | Count | 10 | 12 | 7 | 13 | 42 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 20.0% | 24.0% | 14.0% | 26.0% | 21.0% |
| | NEVER | Count | 6 | 6 | 6 | 17 | 35 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 34.0% | 17.5% |
| Total | | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 |
| | | % within CHAIN | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |