Production & Marketing Reports

Consumer Purchase and Use of Edible Flowers: Results of Three Studies

Kathleen M. Kelley,¹

Bridget K. Behe,²

John A. Biernbaum,³ and

Kenneth L. Poff⁴

ADDITIONAL INDEX WORDS. telephone survey, economics, grocery store, Master Gardener, *Viola tricolor*, *Borago officinalis*, *Tropaeolum majus*

SUMMARY. Three separate marketing studies were conducted during 2000 to determine consumer purchase behavior, use, and potential for purchasing edible flowers. First, a telephone survey was administered to 423 randomly selected residences in the Metro-Detroit area. Participants with some college education were more likely to have eaten edible flowers, would be

more likely to eat them, and would be more likely to buy them. A second survey conducted with 25 Michigan Master Gardeners collected more detailed responses about edible flower purchase and use. Females were more likely to purchase edible flowers than males. Single-person households were less likely to have grown edible flowers than larger households. Participants with an annual income $\leq \$39,999$ were half as likely to have purchased edible flowers as the higher income group. A third consumer survey was conducted over a 6-week period with three Metro-Detroit area grocery stores where consumers purchased containers of edible flowers with an attached survey form. A total of 243 of 360 containers of edible flowers were sold, and we received a 27% response rate. All respondents (100%) with an annual income $\geq \$30,001$ were likely to like the flavor of the flowers. Across all three studies, there were few significant differences between demographic characteristics, which indicates that a homogeneous marketing strategy may effectively reach consumers. Based on these results, there appears to be consumer interest in edible flowers, some consumers have had experience using and serving them, and will purchase them in grocery stores if marketed to attract the consumers interest.

Successful marketing of new products encourages consumer acceptance and has a long-range goal of building loyalty. Many new product manufacturers may, at some time, employ marketing strategies. Sales of products provide one form of evidence for the success of the innovation. For example, sales of beverages called smoothies (blended drinks with fruit and juice) have increased dramatically since this fruity drink meets

multiple needs of consumers such as the health-conscious and individuals looking for a drink or snack. After consumer preferences were assimilated, smoothies were positioned as a meal replacement or nutritional supplement (fruit ingredients containing vitamins, iron, and fiber) as other products appealing to health-conscious consumers were developed or adapted. When additional supplements were added (herbal supplements, added proteins, vitamins, and minerals), the appeal increased for consumer segments seeking this refreshing drink (Restaurant Business, 2000).

Marketing tactics may also be necessary to revive declining sales of existing products by making products more appealing to customers. For example, Sunsweet Growers (Yuba City, Calif.) increased its market share of dried fruit sales (Crecca, 2000) by repositioning (focusing on a new use for a product) Sunsweet's dried fruit product as a component of the produce department. After consumers' needs were assessed, larger quantities were packaged for baking and cooking and for purchase by older consumers, while smaller quantities were packaged for younger consumers and snacking. Thus, Sunsweet adapted existing products to fulfill different needs according to consumer demographics, such as age and product usage. Manufacturers of Willy Wonka candy (Nestle, Glendale, Calif.) adopted a similar marketing strategy by understanding that with each new generation, consumers require something new and exciting every 4 to 5 years. The company continues to change its product line to meet the changing desires of children consumers (Forcinio, 2000).

Similar marketing tactics may be helpful in marketing edible flowers. We submit that the first strategy is to identify consumer groups (segment markets) who would purchase edible flowers and then determine their needs and identify germane characteristics which influence purchases, including product use. Survey instruments can help quantify the demand for edible flowers. Through the use of methods such as telephone or mail surveys, information can be gathered to show who would likely purchase new and existing products (Reed, 1999; Singer et al., 2000). Valuable information, not only about the current product form but also about future products or

Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1325.

Use of trade names does not imply endorsement of the products named or criticism of similar ones not named. The authors thank the State of Michigan Master Gardener Program. The authors also thank The Fred C. Gloeckner Foundation, Inc., for funding this research.

¹Postdoctoral research associate. Current address: Dept. of Horticulture, Pennsylvania State University, 301 Tyson, University Park, PA 16802.

²Associate professor, Department of Horticulture; to whom reprint requests should be sent; email behe@msu.edu.

³Professor, Department of Horticulture.

⁴Professor, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology.

packages, can be collected using survey methods. Information including potential price points and consumer reaction to price changes (price elasticity) can be calculated as well.

Research has shown that consumers and chefs liked physical characteristics of selected edible flowers for use as a garnish, salad, and other applications (Kelley et al., 2001a). A mixture of three flower colors (blue, orange, and yellow) of pansy (*Viola × wittrockiana* 'Accord Banner Clear Mixture') offered in an 8-oz (227-g) container at \$2.99 was the most popular packaged product combination compared to a 16-oz (454-g) container and price of either \$4.98 and \$9.95 (Kelley et al., 2001b). Additionally, consumers valued a container with four flower colors (peach, yellow, orange, and crimson) of nasturtium (*Tropaeolum majus* 'Jewel Mix' and 'Tip Top Apricot') and with at least one other species, borage (*Borago officinalis*) or viola (*Viola tricolor* 'Helen Mount'), more than a container with only one of these species (Kelley et al., 2002). Further studies investigated consumers' preference for high-quality edible flowers and their unwillingness to purchase edible flowers with minor damage (Kelley et al., 2001c).

Mixtures of edible flowers are available in limited locations regionally for consumers and chefs to purchase (Whitman, 1991). Companies such as Frieda's Inc. (Los Alamitos, Calif.) and The Green House Fresh Herbs (San Diego, Calif.) offer edible flowers to several retail stores in a tub-packed container (Kamberg, 1998). Customers can purchase these packages of edible flowers or purchase salads or food items garnished with The Green House's edible flowers (Forkush, 2000). Because products have a limited availability, determining who is purchasing edible flowers and how they are being used is important to help assess future marketability.

The objectives for this research were to determine a) how many consumers in a defined test market area had eaten or purchased edible flowers; b) the percentage of participants who purchased or grew their own edible flowers and where they obtained information on new food products and ideas and; c) consumers' opinions of the edible flowers and their likelihood

of purchasing them for the first time or repeatedly. Three separate marketing studies were conducted during 2000 to accomplish these objectives.

Materials and methods

STUDY 1: TELEPHONE MARKETING SURVEY. The Metro-Detroit area, with an estimated population of 4,482,800 (Sales and Marketing Management, 1998) is a recognized test market where companies frequently test new products before introducing them nationwide (Waldrop, 1992). Team Telcom (East Lansing, Mich.) contacted 423 households from 12 through 14 Jan. 2000. A random sample of households was selected from Lapeer, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, and Wayne counties within the Metro-Detroit area, to compose a sample representative of the Detroit market area. Each household was contacted once, with alternate households contacted if a resident of the first household selected did not answer the telephone. Once household members answered and agreed to participate in the survey, they were asked five questions, including a) whether they had previously eaten edible flowers before; b) whether they had purchased them before; and c) whether they had ever grown them before. Participants were also asked to answer seven demographic questions, including year of birth, gender, number of years of formal education, number of people 18 years and older living in the household, number of people under the age of 18 years, ZIP code, and annual income. Depending upon detail or length of each participants' response, the survey took from 2 to 5 min to complete.

STUDY 2: MASTER GARDENER SURVEY. Twenty-five Master Gardeners (MG) enrolled in a class on 24 June 2000 at Michigan State University to learn about edible flowers. After 1-h presentation covering the history, uses, and flower species safe for consumption, participants were asked to answer 24 questions about edible-flower attributes and the same seven demographic questions as in Study 1. Questions were asked to acquire additional knowledge of consumers usage and perceptions of edible flowers and dining habits, based on information compiled from participants answers in previous studies. Questions included if they would prefer a single species of edible flower or a mixture of edible

flowers, how many dinners they ate at home and away in an average week, the number of hours they worked in their garden, and the importance of several edible-flower packaging attributes. The survey took about 10 min to complete.

STUDY 3: CONSUMER PURCHASING SURVEY. Seventy-four consumers were self-selected, they decided to participate in the research on their own accord, to participate in a survey conducted in cooperation with three food-chain stores in the Metro-Detroit area. The stores were chosen at random from eight chain stores owned by the same Texas-based supermarket company that had currently sold edible flowers and was familiar with storage requirements and shelf life. Only store A sold an additional brand of edible flowers during the experiment. However, antidotal comments from the produce manager indicated that consumers did not purchase these containers and that all were disposed of at the end of each week. Each week, from 14 Apr. through 25 May, flowers were harvested from plants grown for a production experiment, inspected for debris and insects, packaged, and delivered to each of the stores. Each store received 20, 8-oz (227-g) plastic packages which contained six nasturtium and 14 viola flowers. Packages were labeled with two 2.5 × 6.7-cm (1 × 2.6-inch) sticky labels on the top [2.5-cm from either edge]. A fictitious company name and logo, quantity, scientific and common flower name, and contact-person name was presented. Another label with suggested uses (as a salad, for a garnish, to decorate cakes and tarts) was attached to the bottom of the package. A 20.3 × 29.2-cm (8 × 11.5-inch) paper with survey questions was placed in a 7 × 13-cm (2.8 × 5.1-inch) sealable plastic bag (Fisher Scientific, Chicago), along with a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope, and attached with clear plastic tape to the bottom of the package. Consumers who purchased the packages were asked to return the survey in the envelope provided. Each survey was marked with a letter (A, B, C), assigned by the researchers, that corresponded to one of the three stores and a number that corresponded to the week that the package was prepared. Packages were placed in each store's produce department near the loose mesclun lettuce-mix bin. Packages were priced at \$3.99, \$2.99, and \$1.99

during the first, second, and third through sixth weeks of the study, respectively. Three hundred sixty packages were distributed to the stores during the experiment, with a total of 243 packages sold through the 6-week period. Participants were asked questions including a) whether they had eaten or purchased edible flowers before; b) whether they were more likely to purchase the package because the flowers were grown pesticide free; c) how long they stored the flowers before use; d) whether they served the flowers to males, females, or both; and e) whether they had any comments about the package. Participants were also asked six demographic questions similar to those in Studies 1 and 2.

For all three experiments, data were subjected to analysis with SPSS (Chicago) using a two-tailed *t* test ($P \leq 0.05$) and the Kruskal Wallis test ($P \leq 0.05$).

Results and discussion

STUDY 1: TELEPHONE MARKETING SURVEY. Of the 423 participants who were contacted in the telephone survey, 42% were males, a higher percentage of the sample than in other similar surveys (Kelley et al., 2001a, 2001b) (Table 1), but more representative of the 49.1% of males in the American population (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 2001). With more males participating in the survey, there was a better representation of responses for the general population. Results showed that a similar percentage of men and women (18% and 15%, respectively) had eaten edible flowers before and that similarly smaller percentages of both genders had purchased them. Most participants were able to identify the species they had eaten, many of

which could be found on a list of edible flowers reported to be safe to consume (Barash 1998a, 1998b).

About one-third of all males and females would eat edible flowers in the future and 51% reported they would purchase edible flowers in the future. A previous study identified individuals who intended to purchase edible flowers in the future, but would use the edible flowers only for garnishes. These individuals and were classified as Persuadable Garnishers and with more experience they may eventually use them as an ingredient in a meal (Kelley et al., 2001b). This segment appeared to identify a large number of this study's participants.

Segmentation scenarios could be based on demographic characteristics other than gender. Few significant differences existed when responses were segmented based on other demographic characteristics, such as number of people in the household 18 years of age and older (1 and ≥ 2) and participants' income ($\leq \$75,000$ and $\geq \$75,001$). However, participants ≤ 50 years of age were more likely to consider eating edible flowers (40%) than older participants (31%). In addition, more participants (21%) in a household with no one under age 18 years purchased edible flowers before the study compared with households with at least one person under the age of 18 years (2%). They were also more likely to consider eating edible flowers (44%) than their counterparts (31%). More participants with some level of college education had eaten edible flowers (18%) than participants with no college education (8%). When the same comparisons were made based on level of education, participants with some college education were also more likely

to consider eating edible flowers (42% versus 25%) and would be more likely to buy edible flowers in a store (57% versus 36%).

These results were consistent with results from studies that included participants involved in a gardening-related program the day they took the survey (Kelley et al., 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002). In this telephone survey, participants were selected at random and did not necessarily have an interest in gardening or related activities. Nevertheless, the percentages of participants who would consider eating and purchasing edible flowers in this study, indicated a general positive attitude indicative of potential acceptance by the general public. Although market segmentation is a fundamental tenet of successful marketing, our results suggest that a homogeneous marketing strategy would be warranted and effective, since few demographic characteristics affected responses.

The fundamental marketing premise that one size fits all did not hold in this case and the next step to divide the population into segments with similar identifiable characteristics was not needed. Apparently, the segment of consumers who purchased or ate edible flowers are similar to people who did not. Differences were only evident for those who were not college graduates and those had some college education when asked if they had eaten edible flowers before ($P = 0.002$) and for households with zero people under the age of 18 years and those with one or more person when asked if they had purchased them before ($P = 0.012$). Thus, a single homogeneous marketing strategy could effectively be developed to encourage purchase and consumption of edible flowers. Addi-

Table 1. Effect of gender, age, formal education, number of people in household ≥ 18 years old, number of people ≤ 18 years of age, and annual income on consumers' answers to questions asked during a telephone interview conducted 12 to 14 Jan. 2000.

Edible-flower attribute	Gender		Age (years)		College education		No. of people in household				Annual income (\$)	
							≥18 years		≤18 years			
	Male	Female	≤50	≥51	No	Some	1	≥2	0	≥1	≤75,000	≥75,001
	Sample size (no.)	177	246	210	192	175	244	94	326	140	281	190
Eaten edible flowers before (%)	18	15	12	16	8	18*	9	16	12	15	12	17
Purchased edible flowers before (%)	14	3	7	9	14	6	0	9	21	2*	4	10
Would consider eating edible flowers (%)	36	35	40	31*	25	42*	28	37	44	31*	33	37
Has grown edible flowers (%)	25	24	17	31	18	28	19	26	22	26	22	27
Would buy edible flowers at a store (%)	55	48	50	53	36	57*	53	50	50	52	51	51

*Percentage differences of attributes within categories (gender, age, etc.). Significant at $P \leq 0.05$ according to a Kruskal Wallis test.

tional research may uncover variables not included here beyond demographic characteristics which do create a viable basis for market segmentation.

STUDY 2: MASTER GARDENER SURVEY. Few differences were evident in the MG participants' responses in comparison to study 1 (Table 2). Most participants answered questions favorably in regard to purchase and use of edible flowers. Sixty-seven percent of males and females were very likely to purchase edible flowers for use in a salad, and higher percentages of participants being very likely to purchase edible flowers for other uses. Responses compared by gender showed that fewer males than females (67% and 100%, respectively) would purchase edible flowers without a designated specific

use. Waldrop (1993) suggested that a group with this response pattern who were MGs, compared with three other distinct groups of gardeners, was the most experienced (with plants) and committed to gardening. They were more likely to devote equal time to gardening with vegetables and ornamentals and were the most likely group to spend time and money on other gardening subdivisions such as herb gardens. Waldrop also suggested that MGs were willing to read gardening books and magazines for information. It is possible MGs may be more informed about and accepting of edible flowers than other gardeners and/or the general population as a result of this quest for knowledge. They could be a group to target for promotions and

incentives associated with edible-flower purchases as their interest level may be higher than the general population.

Some differences were identified according to MG participants' answers. MG participants with an income $\leq \$39,999$ were half as likely to garden as participants with an income $\geq \$40,000$. Forty-four percent of MG participants in the higher income category had eaten two or more dinners at a restaurant in an individual week compared to zero restaurant dinners for MG participants in the lower income category. All households with two or more people 18 years of age and older had grown edible flowers before, whereas only half of single-family-member of any age group households had grown them.

Table 2. Effect of gender, age, formal education, number of people in household ≥ 18 years of age, number of people in household ≤ 18 years of age, and annual income on consumers' answers to questions asked during a survey conducted at a Master Gardener conference during 24 June 2000.

Edible-flower attribute	Gender		Age (years)		College education		No. of people in household				Annual income	
							≥18 years		≤18 years		(\$)	
	Male	Female	≤54	≥56	Some	Graduate	1	≥2	0	≥1	≤39,999	≥40,000
Sample size (no.)	3	22	15	10	9	16	6	19	19	6	4	19
Would be very likely to purchase for a meal (%)	67	68	60	80	56	75	83	63	68	67	75	74
Would be very likely to purchase to use in a salad (%)	67	67	73	80	67	81	83	74	74	83	75	79
Would be very likely to purchase for a garnish (%)	100	73	80	70	67	81	100	68	74	83	100	74
Would be very likely to purchase if grown organically (%)	100	77	80	80	78	81	100	74	84	67	100	79
Would be very likely to grow edible flowers (%)	67	96	87	100	89	94	83	95	90	100	75	95
Would be very likely to purchase if 10% insect damaged (%)	33	36	33	40	22	44	50	32	37	33	50	37
Prefers a mixture of different colored edible flowers over a single color (%)	100	96	93	100	100	94	100	95	100	83	100	95
Prefers a mixture of different species of edible flowers over a single species (%)	33	67	67	80	67	75	67	74	74	67	100	63
Have eaten edible flowers before (%)	67	91	87	90	78	94	83	90	90	84	75	90
Would eat edible flowers in the future (%)	33	96	93	100	89	100	100	95	95	100	100	95
Has purchased edible flowers (%)	0	14	13	10	0	19	17	11	11	17	25	11
Would purchase edible flowers (%)	67	100*	90	100	100	92	80	100	92	100	50	100*
Has grown edible flowers (%)	67	91	87	90	89	88	50	100*	84	100	75	90
Has eaten five or fewer dinners at home in a week (%)	33	67	71	50	78	53	83	44	63	60	100	50
Has eaten two or more dinners at a restaurant in a week (%)	33	62	71	40	67	53	83	50	58	60	0	44*
Spends 10 h or more gardening each week (%)	33	50	60	90	89	63	50	79	74	67	75	68
Would prefer the same characteristics when buying edible flowers as when buying flowers for decoration (%)	0	28	18	38	50	15	20	29	29	20	33	29
Would prefer the same color when buying edible flowers as when buying flowers for decoration (%)	50	48	50	44	50	47	40	50	47	50	33	44

*Percentage differences of attributes within categories (gender, age, etc.). Significant at $P \leq 0.05$ according to a Kruskal Wallis test.

Table 3. Number of edible-flower packages sold weekly at each of three grocery stores in the Metro-Detroit area from 14 Apr. to 25 May 2000.

Store	No. of packages sold (date packages delivered to stores)					
	Week					
	1 (14 Apr.)	2 (21 Apr.)	3 (28 Apr.)	4 (4 May)	5 (11 May)	6 (18 May)
A	15	18	17	8	17	13
B	16	20	20	18	19	12
C	7	20	20	NA	NA	NA
Price (%)	3.99	2.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99
Total packages placed in stores (no.)	60	60	60	60	60	60
Total packages sold (no.)	38	58	57	26	39	25
Total packages sold (%)	63	97	95	43	60	42
Surveys returned (no.)	12	10	16	8	12	6
Surveys returned (%)	32	17	28	31	33	24

MG participants were asked several open-ended questions to gather information that would help define the sources consumers use to find ideas for entertaining and using new food ingredients such as edible flowers. Eighty percent of MG participants stated they obtained information which influenced their use of new food ingredients from many sources, which included cookbooks, magazines, the Internet, friends or neighbors, and food programs on cable or satellite television networks. Edible-flower growers and markets can use these information sources to promote products in recipes that could be easily adapted to consumers' kitchens and entertaining purposes. The MG par-

ticipants also noted that they had eaten edible flowers in salads and seen them as garnishes, desserts, and main courses at friends' or neighbors' homes or at restaurants, and would use the same methods for edible flowers they purchased.

STUDY 3: CONSUMER PURCHASING SURVEY. Although store customer counts and daily sales figures were unavailable, researchers observed that edible flowers priced at \$3.99 per unit sold two-thirds as many units as those priced at \$2.99 (Table 3). Forty percent of the total containers sold were during the first 2 weeks. We did not observe a dramatic increase in purchasing of edible-flower containers when the price was lowered, and sales

remained fairly consistent during the last 3 weeks of the experiment [with at least 42% (week 6) to 60% (week 5) of packages sold in 1 week] when the price was constant at \$1.99. Based on the maximum revenue calculated for the packages sold at \$3.99, \$2.99, or \$1.99 during week 1, 2, or 3, the results indicate that the optimum price is \$2.99. Multiplying the price of the package (\$2.99) by the quantity sold (58) during week 2 generated \$173.42. These earnings are greater than those for week 1 (\$3.99 × 38) with a total of \$151.62 or week 3 (\$1.99 × 57) with a total of \$113.43.

Survey responses for each week were also fairly consistent during the experiment, with a weekly return rate

Table 4. Effect of gender, age, formal education, number of people in household ≥18 years of age, number of people in household ≤18 years of age, and annual income on consumers' answers to questions asked on a survey question attached to a package of edible flowers purchased at a grocery store during 14 Apr. to 25 May 2000.

Edible-flower attribute	Gender		Age (years)		College graduate		No. of people in household				Annual income	
							≥18 years		≤18 years		(\$)	
	Male	Female	≤47	≥48	No	Yes	1	≥2	0	≥1	≤30,000	≥30,001
Sample size (no.)	19	45	34	32	8	58	11	55	41	25	10	56
Eaten edible flowers before (%)	84	89	79	94	75	88	82	87	88	84	80	88
Purchased edible flowers before (%)	42	55	39	63	38	53	64	48	54	46	50	51
More likely to purchase because they were grown pesticide free (%)	100	98	100	97	100	98	100	98	98	100	100	98
Detected an odor (%)	67	67	76	57	71	68	73	67	68	67	90	63
Thought the odor was pleasant (%)	100	96	100	94	100	97	100	97	96	100	100	97
Stored flowers for more than one day (%)	50	49	38	58	47	50	30	51	54	38	33	50
Liked the flavor of the flowers (%)	100	97	100	96	100	98	100	98	97	100	100	98
Prefers a mixture of different species of edible flowers over a single species (%)	95	93	94	93	100	93	100	92	92	96	92	100
Served flowers to												
females (%)	0	20*	15	13	13	16	11	15	10	90	75	11
males (%)	5	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	21	15	0
both (%)	95	80	82	87	87	82	89	83	2	4	83	89
Would be more likely to purchase if the container had a recipe attached (%)	63	44	52	52	52	50	30	56	50	54	63	50

*Percentage differences of attributes within categories (gender, age, etc.). Significant at $P \leq 0.05$ according to a two-tailed t-test and Kruskal Wallis test.

of 17% (lowest response rate for 1 week was week 2) and 33% (highest response for 1 week was week 5) of surveys returned from purchased containers, depending on the week. Some of the variation in the percent of returned surveys could be due to response rates being lower if participants purchased more than one container at a time or purchased containers on more than one occasion and chose to return only one survey.

COMBINED RESULTS. Survey responses from each store were tested to determine whether there were significant differences among participant demographics. The mean age of participants from stores A and C were 8 years younger than participants from store B. Twenty-four percent more participants from store A were college graduates than participants from stores B and C. Since only these two significant differences were found, the researchers pooled the data to create a larger data set for analyzing the participants' impressions and opinions about the containers of edible flowers.

Of the 243 containers of edible flowers sold during the 6-week period (67% of containers placed in stores), an average of 27% of the surveys were returned (Table 3). This return rate was higher than the typical response rate for a direct-mail survey (11%). Only 1 in 10 direct mail campaigns achieve a 30% or higher response rate (Reed, 1999).

As in the previous study, differences were minimal when analyzing participants' responses (Table 4). The only significant difference between the demographic groups occurred for gender where more female participants served the edible flowers to female guests than the male participants (20 and 0, respectively).

When the entire data set was analyzed, we found that 86% of the participants who returned the survey had eaten edible flowers before; however, only 51% had purchased them. A majority of participants were aware of edible flowers and their uses. Self-selected grocery store participants, by purchasing the container of edible flowers, were asked to add comments with regard to packaging and containers. Twenty-four percent of participants who returned the survey said the clear packaging and minimal labeling allowed them to look at the flowers better and see their quality. Eleven percent of participants reported that the area where packages were dis-

played (near the mesclun lettuce mix) was the most appropriate location and that adding an expiration date would be helpful. Previous research showed that flower color was the most important factor that influenced purchase of edible flowers accounting (Kelley et al., 2001b).

Conclusion

From the results of three surveys we found that there was an awareness of edible flowers among the general public, gardening groups, and consumers who shop at grocery stores. Participants in all three groups rated edible-flower characteristics and use or eating edible flowers highly favorable. Although only 17% of the participants in the telephone survey previously consumed or purchased edible flowers, 36% would consider doing so and 17% stated that they would purchase them from a grocery store or market. These percentages are favorable considering that edible flowers are a niche item and may not be purchased for everyday use, but would probably be purchased for entertaining, during the holidays, or for special occasions. With 57% of the participants in the consumer purchasing survey stating that they had never purchased edible flowers before, these participants may have purchased our package on impulse or because of the attractiveness and quality of the flowers. If the telephone survey participants were in a grocery store or market, they might purchase the container when they saw it displayed next to a complementary item such as mesclun mix.

With the MG survey participants, 88% had previously eaten edible flowers, with the same percentage stating that they had grown them in their gardens. Verbal comments have indicated that these participants might purchase edible flowers only during the winter, and in larger quantities than they could harvest from their own gardens. They might also purchase them if species or cultivars available in the grocery store were not growing in their own garden.

The surveyed groups would purchase only high-quality edible flowers, and those who buy the containers need to complete more surveys so that adjustments in content, labeling, or information offered can be made. New edible-flower mixes and quantities could be offered according to seasonal appropriateness or consumers' taste.

Literature cited

- Barash, C.W. 1998a. The flavors of flowers. *Herb Companion* 10(4):32-37.
- Barash, C.W. 1998b. Please eat the flowers. *Horticulture* 95(5):36-40.
- Crecca, D.H. 2000. So sweet. *Supermkt. Bus. Category Captains* 2000 Suppl. p. 17-18.
- Forcinio, H. 2000. Manufacturer of the year: Imagination wins at Willy Wonka. *Candy Ind.* 165(11):22-29.
- Forkush, R.H. 2000. Flower power. *Produce Bus.* 16(3):38-39.
- Kamberg, M. 1998. Warm winter promotions. *PM Plus Seasonal Merchandising* 1998 Suppl. *Produce Merchandising and The Packer*. p. 36-46.
- Kelley, K.M., B.K. Behe, J.A. Biernbaum, and K.L. Poff. 2001a. Consumer and professional chef perceptions of three edible flower species. *HortScience* 36(1):162-166.
- Kelley, K.M., B.K. Behe, J.A. Biernbaum, and K.L. Poff. 2001b. Consumer preference for edible-flower color, container size, and price. *HortScience* 36(4):801-801.
- Kelley, K.M., B.K. Behe, J.A. Biernbaum, and K.L. Poff. 2001c. Consumer ratings of edible-flower quality, mix, and color. *HortTechnology* 11(4):644-647.
- Kelley, K.M., B.K. Behe, J.A. Biernbaum, and K.L. Poff. 2002. Combinations of colors and species of containerized edible flowers: Effect on consumer preferences. *HortScience* (in press).
- Reed, D. 1999. Mail dominance. *Mkt. Week* 22(45):41-45.
- Restaurant Business. 2000. Life in a blender. *Restaurant Bus.* 99(23):48-50.
- Sales and Marketing Management. 1998. 1998 Survey of buying power and media markets. Sales and Marketing Management, New York.
- Singer, E., J. Van Hoewyk, and M.P. Maher. 2000. Experiments with incentives in telephone surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(2):171-188.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. 2001. Profiles of general demographic characteristics. 2000 Census of population and housing, United States. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. 28 Dec. 2001. <<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2001/2khus.pdf>>.
- Waldrop, J. 1992. All-American markets. *Amer. Demogr.* 14(1):24-30.
- Waldrop, J. 1993. Garden variety customers. *Amer. Demogr.* 15(4):44-48.
- Whitman, A.T. 1991. Edible flowers and culinary herbs: New uses for traditional crops, new crops for traditional growers. *GrowerTalks* 54(13):22-33.