

MEAT OF TRADITIONAL AND ALTERNATIVE POULTRY SPECIES IN THE CATERING INDUSTRY

*Janusz F. Pomianowski, Zuzanna Sadłowska,
Jolanta Wieczorek*

Chair of Commodity Science and Food Analysis
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

Key words: traditional poultry species, alternative poultry species, catering industry, poultry meat.

Abstract

This study discusses the popularity of meat from traditional and alternative poultry species in the catering industry. Data for analysis was obtained directly from questionnaires filled out by persons who were responsible for the selection of food ingredients in catering establishments. The respondents were asked about the use of traditional and alternative poultry species in their restaurants and the effect of menu items containing alternative poultry meat on business results.

Chicken meat was the most popular type of poultry that was served by all surveyed facilities (100%), followed by turkey meat (83%). The meat of alternative poultry species, including quail and helmeted guineafowl (43%) and pheasant (20%), was less frequently served on account of its lower popularity among consumers and a high price. The average price per serving was determined at PLN 13.16 for chicken, PLN 32.15 for quail, PLN 31.77 for pheasant and PLN 30.00 for guineafowl. Despite the fact that the meat of alternative poultry species is rarely served by catering establishments, nearly 75% of the surveyed facilities claimed that its presence in the menu improves business results.

MIĘSO DROBIU TYPOWEGO I ALTERNATYWNEGO W GASTRONOMII

Janusz F. Pomianowski, Zuzanna Sadłowska, Jolanta Wieczorek

Katedra Towaroznawstwa i Badań Żywności
Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie

Słowa kluczowe: drób tradycyjny, drób alternatywny, gastronomia, mięso drobiowe.

Abstrakt

W pracy oceniano wykorzystanie mięsa drobiu typowego i nietypowego w gastronomii. Dane pozyskano bezpośrednio za pomocą kwestionariuszy ankietowych. Respondentami były osoby odpowiedzialne za wybór surowców w zakładzie. Pytania dotyczyły wykorzystania drobiu typowego i nietypowego oraz wpływu stosowania drobiu nietypowego na efektywność działania lokalu.

Najczęściej stosowano w gastronomii mięso kurczaka, używają go wszystkie badane zakłady (100%), oraz indyka (83%). Wśród drobiu nietypowego w równej ilości zakłady korzystają z przepiórek i perlic (43%), mniej z bażantów (20%). Wpływa na to mała powszechność drobiu nietypowego oraz jego cena, zbyt duża dla konsumentów. Średnia cena porcji kurczaka (13,16 zł) w porównaniu ze średnią ceną porcji przepiórki (32,15 zł), bażanta (31,77 zł) czy perlicy (30,00 zł) jest znacznie niższa. Mimo faktu, że drób nietypowy pojawia się sporadycznie, to jego obecność w ofercie pozytywnie wpływa na działalność zakładu gastronomicznego, stwierdziło tak prawie 3/4 właścicieli lokali.

Introduction

Poultry meat was a specialty of Polish cuisine in the past. Until recently, pheasant, quail and helmeted guineafowl were regarded as expensive delicacies. The status of alternative poultry meat began to change when Poland joined the European Union. Food suppliers have to cater to the consumer's needs in order to generate profits and survive on Europe's increasingly competitive food market (TRZISZKA et al. 2006).

Contemporary consumers are increasingly likely to explore new foods and flavors (KWIATKOWSKA and LEVYTSKA 2007). The growing interest in novel foods prompts catering businesses to reach for long-forgotten ingredients and recipes, and it encourages poultry breeders to expand their product range. The supply of alternative poultry species, including pigeons, helmeted guineafowls, quails and pheasants, is on the rise. In view of the above, the objective of this study was to evaluate the popularity of traditional and alternative poultry species in the catering industry.

Materials and Methods

The data obtained during the tests directly in catering establishments using survey questionnaires. The respondents were people who by their functions in the plant had the highest-rated knowledge on the use of the different types of raw materials (including poultry) – owners or chefs. The questionnaire was designed with 15 questions of which only a fraction has been included in the present study. The questions were closed type with a choice of one answer. In three of the questions and respond applied based on the Likert scale. The study analyzed 135 pieces total units: restaurant – 40 pcs., pensions and – 45 pcs., houses wedding – 30 pcs., inns – 40 pieces. The results were processed using Microsoft Excel 2010.

Results and Discussion

The selection of foods served by the surveyed facilities is presented in Table 1. The results of the survey indicate that poultry is highly popular in the catering industry. Chicken meat was the most popular type of poultry that was served by 100% of the analyzed establishments. It was followed by turkey meat (83.33%) that was not served by 28.57% restaurants and 16.67% wedding centers in the group of surveyed facilities. An analysis of waterfowl species revealed that geese and ducks enjoyed similar popularity and were served by more than 50% of the surveyed establishments. Goose meat was somewhat more popular than duck meat in wedding centers and inns. Similar results were reported for helmeted guineafowls and quails which were served by less than half of the analyzed facilities. Pheasants were the least popular poultry species that were found in the menus of only 20% of catering facilities. Pheasant meat was served sporadically in the majority of the surveyed establishments. The meat of pheasants and helmeted guineafowls was not included in the menus of any of the analyzed inns. Pigeon meat is a relatively popular food item at home and in regional cuisine, but despite the above, it was not served by any of the surveyed catering facilities.

Table 1
Poultry meat most frequently served by catering facilities [%]

Specification		Total	Restaurant	Boarding house	Wedding center	Inn	
Type of poultry	traditional	chicken	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		turkey	83.33	71.43	100.00	83.33	100.00
		goose	56.67	50.00	42.86	83.33	66.67
		duck	53.33	57.14	57.14	50.00	33.33
	alternative	quail	43.33	50.00	28.57	50.00	33.33
		pheasant	20.00	7.14	28.57	50.00	0.00
		helmeted guineafowl	43.33	42.86	42.86	66.67	0.00
		pigeon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

The availability of various types of poultry meat in the investigated restaurants is presented in Table 2. In most of the surveyed facilities, dishes based on the meat of traditional poultry species were listed in the main menu. In all restaurants, chicken and turkey were available only as part of the main menu. In some facilities, the meat of waterfowl species, including geese and ducks, was listed in the main menu, whereas in other restaurants, it was available only on special order.

Table 2

Availability of poultry meat in the offer of catering establishments [%]

Specification			Total	Restaurant	Boarding house	Wedding center	Inn
Menu	traditional	chicken	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		turkey	83.33	71.43	100.00	83.33	100.00
		goose	23.33	21.43	14.29	33.33	33.33
		duck	33.33	21.43	42.86	50.00	33.33
	alternative	quail	33.33	42.86	28.57	0.00	33.33
		pheasant	13.33	7.14	28.57	16.67	0.00
		helmeted guineafowl	30.00	35.71	28.57	33.33	0.00
		pigeon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Special order	traditional	chicken	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		turkey	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		goose	33.33	28.57	28.57	50.00	33.33
		duck	20.00	35.71	14.29	0.00	0.00
	alternative	quail	10.00	7.14	0.00	33.33	0.00
		pheasant	6.67	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00
		helmeted guineafowl	13.33	7.14	14.29	33.33	0.00
		pigeon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

The availability of alternative poultry meat was characterized by a supply profile in the analyzed establishments. Dishes based on alternative poultry meat were listed in the menu of approximately 2/3 of the surveyed restaurants, and they were available on special order in the remaining 1/3 of the examined facilities. It should be noted that meat served on special order does not contribute to the popularity for less known poultry species because consumers are reluctant to reach for products they are not familiar with (GRUNERT 1996, ISSANCHOU 1996).

A comparison of the above data with the results indicating the popularity of various types of poultry meat among the clients of catering outlets reveals significant discrepancies (Table 3). Chicken was the most popular poultry meat in all of the surveyed facilities, and it was the only item with balanced supply and demand. The demand for the remaining types of poultry meat was significantly lower, which could be attributed to fact that alternative poultry, in particular waterfowl species, is absent from traditional Polish cuisine. Surprisingly, the study also revealed a relatively low demand for turkey meat.

The demand for alternative poultry meat was very low. In this group of products, the meat of the helmeted guineafowl was most popular with clients

in the surveyed establishments. The above can be attributed to low levels of knowledge about the meat of alternative poultry species among consumers.

Table 3
Poultry meat most popular among consumers [%]

Specification		Total	Restaurant	Boarding house	Wedding center	Inn	
Type of poultry	traditional	chicken	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		turkey	36.67	21.43	28.57	83.33	33.33
		goose	13.33	21.43	0.00	0.00	33.33
		duck	13.33	14.29	14.29	16.67	0.00
	alternative	quail	13.33	7.14	28.57	16.67	0.00
		pheasant	10.00	7.14	14.29	16.67	0.00
		helmeted guineafowl	26.67	28.57	14.29	50.00	0.00
		pigeon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Restaurant menus generally reflect consumer preferences. The trends in menu offerings are largely determined by consumers who search for outlets that guarantee the most satisfactory sensory experience (BABICZ-ZIELIŃSKA 2000, BABICZ-ZIELIŃSKA and ZABROCKI 2007, EARLE et al. 2007).

The low popularity of alternative poultry meat among restaurant clients can also be attributed to the high price of those products (CHMIELEWSKA 2000, JEŻEWSKA-ZYCHOWICZ 2004, KWIATKOWSKA and LEVYTSKA 2007, NOWAK and TRZISZKA 2006). The average price per one serving of chicken was PLN 13.16 whereas the average prices of alternative poultry dishes were significantly higher at PLN 32.15 for quail, PLN 31.77 for pheasant and PLN 30.00 for helmeted guineafowl (Table 4). A comparison of different types of surveyed facilities indicates that the highest poultry prices were charged by inns.

The data shown in Table 5 illustrates the effect of menu items containing alternative poultry meat on business results. According to the majority of respondents, the availability of dishes based on alternative poultry had a positive influence on business performance. The highest number of respondents arguing that alternative poultry dishes had a definitely positive effect on business performance were representatives of inns, whereas the representatives of wedding centers were least likely to share the above opinion. At the same time, wedding center respondents were most likely to agree that alternative poultry had a positive influence on business results. Neutral responses claiming that alternative poultry had a somewhat positive effect on business were given by 14 to 21 of the analyzed catering establishments, excluding inns.

Only representatives of restaurants (7 respondents) claimed that alternative poultry did not contribute to an improvement in business performance. The noted results seem to suggest that consumers have a growing interest in foods characterized by high quality, supreme sensory attributes and a high nutritional value (GRĘBOWIEC 2010, NOWAK et al. 2008, WIELEWSKA 2004).

Table 4
Price per one serving of poultry meat [PLN]

Specification		Average	Restaurant	Boarding house	Wedding center	Inn	
Type of poultry	traditional	chicken	13.16	12.35	11.60	12.00	16.70
		turkey	15.83	15.40	14.40	15.20	18.30
		goose	19.78	17.60	17.00	18.00	26.50
		duck	18.33	17.80	17.50	18.00	20.00
	alternative	quail.	29.65	28.50	37.50	20.00	32.60
		pheasant	32.07	32.00	29.90	34.30	–
		helmeted guineafowl	30.00	28.90	31.30	29.80	–
		pigeon	–	–	–	–	–

Table 5
The effect of menu items containing alternative poultry meat on business results [%]

Specification	Total	Restaurant	Boarding house	Wedding center	Inn
Definitely yes	43.33	42.86	42.86	33.33	66.67
Yes	36.67	28.57	42.86	50.00	33.33
Neither yes nor no	16.67	21.43	14.29	16.67	0.00
No	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Definitely not	3.33	7.14	0.00	0.00	0.00

Conclusions

1. The meat of traditional poultry species was served by the surveyed catering facilities in considerably larger amounts than alternative poultry meat which accounted for a small part of their menu offerings. Alternative poultry meat remains relatively unpopular among consumers.

2. The low demand for the meat of alternative poultry species can be attributed mainly to the high price of those products.

3. Despite the fact that alternative poultry meat is sporadically served by catering establishments, nearly 75% of the respondents were of the opinion that the presence of alternative poultry in the menu had a positive effect on business results.

Accepted for print 9.02.2017.

References

- BABICZ-ZIELIŃSKA E., ZABROCKI R. 2007. *Konsument XXI wieku*. Przem. Spoż., 1(61): 6–8.
- BABICZ-ZIELIŃSKA E. 2000. *Czynniki wpływające na wybór żywności. Konsument żywności i jego zachowania rynkowe*. Ogólnopol. Konf. Nauk. 12–13 października, Warszawa, pp. 245–253.
- CHMIELEWSKA B. 2000. *Zachowania producentów rolnych i konsumentów w świetle rozwoju współczesnego marketingu. Konsument żywności i jego zachowania rynkowe*. Ogólnopol. Konf. Nauk. 12–13 października, Warszawa, pp. 21–32.
- EARLE M., EARLE R., ANDERSON A. 2007. *Opracowanie produktów spożywczych – podejście marketingowe*. WNT, Warszawa.
- GREBOWIEC M. 2010. *Czynniki warunkujące jakość oraz ich wpływ na podejmowanie decyzji nabywczych na rynku gastronomicznym*. Zesz. Nauk. SGGW EIOGŻ, Warszawa, 80: 117–130.
- GRUNERT K.G. 2006. *Future trends and consumer lifestyles with regard to meat consumption*. Meat Sci., 74: 149–160.
- ISSANCHOU S. 1996. *Consumer expectations and perceptions of meat and meat product quality*. Meat Sci., 43(5): 5–19.
- JEŻEWSKA-ZYCHOWICZ M. 2004. *Charakterystyka zachowań konsumentów na rynku żywności gotowej do spożycia oraz usług gastronomicznych*. Roczn. Nauk. SERiA, Warszawa, t. VI, z. 2, 121.
- KWIATKOWSKA E., LEVYTSKA G. 2007. *Stan i kierunki rozwoju polskiego rynku usług gastronomicznych*. Zesz. Nauk. SGGW EIOGŻ, 63: 135–144.
- NOWAK M., TRZISZKA T., OTTO J. 2008. *Pozycja jakości posiłków wśród czynników kształtujących preferencje nabywców usług gastronomicznych*. Żywn. Technol. Jakość, 58: 132–140.
- NOWAK M., TRZISZKA T. 2006. *Preferencje konsumentów żywności wygodnej z mięsa drobiowego*. Żywn. Technol. Jakość, 2(47): 133–141.
- TRZISZKA T., NOWAK M., KAŻMIERSKA M. 2006. *Preferencje konsumentów jaj na rynku wrocławskim*. Żywn. Technol. Jakość, 3(48): 107–117.
- WIELEWSKA I. 2004. *Wymagania jakościowe konsumentów żywności w świetle badań*. Roczniki Naukowe SERiA, t. VI, z. 2, Warszawa, pp. 330–334.