by Sarrah Jessica Hidayat

Submission date: 06-Jun-2024 09:45AM (UTC+0700) Submission ID: 2396577965 File name: ICGTSAVE_vol_1_no._1_2024_hal_43-62.pdf (2.29M) Word count: 7627 Character count: 34132



I Gede Wiwin Suyasa,

Email: wiwin.visionpplanner@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Food & Beverages (F&B) in the Tourism Industry is the most exciting and challenging fields. After almost a decade of losing its prestige, where many hotels had eliminated their F&B outlets, the business climate and consumer consumption patterns are raising the culinary passion and culinary service to the stage again. However, it must be admitted that the restaurant industry is a risky business. Some studies have found that up to 25% of new restaurants fail before the first year, and the percentage of failures is even more significant within five years (Valen, 1887).

Lately, restaurants within hotel operations vary in style, from a simple, familiar, millennial-contemporary, characterized by an open kitchen with Postmodern decoration, and service is closely related to Gatget and up fusion-tech culinary. However, the excitement and

creativity of F&B Service have clear common threads to the menu. The menu reflects the restaurant image, which describes the dishes that customers will enjoy in a distinctive and appetizing style, and the menu distinguishes one restaurant from another. Essier Resto is an all-day dining restaurant at the Vasini Smart Boutique Hotel poolside at Jalan WR Supratman, Tohpati, Denpasar Bali, Indonesia. The decoration of this restaurant is designed in such a way, starting from the selection of wall color accents, colors and furniture layouts, and counter bars to swimming pool backgrounds, creating an artistic modern minimalist impression. Essier menu presents east-meet-west culinary. The menu's cover is an elegant dark color, designed with vector bakery ornaments, pastries, fruits, vegetables, dairy products, ice cream, and other related ornaments.



Figure 1. Front cover and back cover of Essier Restaurant menu book

The Essier Restaurant's menu grouped the items into eight according to type and taste. This grouping is intended to assist consumers in making choices according to their wishes and entice the customer to try other exciting dishes with vivid pictures of dishes. The grouping is as follows:

- a. Part 1. Appetiser & Soup, which consists of 5 menu items
- b. Part 2. The Vasini's Signatures, consisting of 5 Menu Items
- c. Part 3. Balinese Food, consisting of 5 menu items
- d. Part 4. Indonesian Food consists of 6 menu items
- e. Part 5. Asian &; International Food, consists of 7 menu items
- f. Part 6. Dessert, consists of 7 items menus
- g. Part 7. Side dish, consists of 2 items
- h. Part 8. Cook with the chef, for guests who want certain dishes that are not on the regular menu.



Figure 2. Part 1 of the Menu Figure 3. Part 2 of the Menu



Figure 4. Part 3 of the Menu Figure 5. Part 4 of the Menu



Figure 6. Part 5A of the Menu Figure 7. Part 5B of the Menu

<image>

Figure 8. Part 6A of the Menu Figure 9. Part 6B of the Menu



Figure 10. Part 7 and Part 8 of the Menu

Considering the layout and presentation techniques, and images displayed in the menu, all menu items offered are so interesting and appetizing to taste them.

Therefore, we are interested in knowing the position of each menu compared to one another, which menu contributes the most, and which menus need attention to be more salable and profitable, by applying Menu Engineering formula according to menu classification at Essier Restaurant of The Vasini Smart Boutique Hotel, Bali, Indonesia. This study positively contributes to the development of Essier Restaurant related to the evaluation of the contribution of each menu item and its profit. We limited the study to data available at Essier Restaurant from January to December 2022 by applying the menu engineering analysis. This paper can be

useful as a main reference for the student and academic institution in comprehending how the menu engineering analysis works, while for industry professional, the manual data analysis approach of this study can be considerably friendly to follow, and will produce a Menu Engineering Analysis report to determine the quadrant of menu items. This is a critica to the success of restaurant operations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A menu engineering analysis is an approach used in evaluating menu items to determine whether items that have a high profit have sold. The analysis in the form of four boxes describes the menu categories that have been analyzed from the group ratings contained in the Menu mix. What determines the profitability of a menu is not a percentage of its cost but is the contribution margin of the menu item. Another determining factor is the number (volume) of menu items sold [2]. Menu development will always be needed; It is an ongoing and dynamic operational process as the menu should be dynamic and should not be "freeze by time". Menu development is an evolutionary process of continuous development and improvement [3]. Menu is the main determinant of the success or failure of a Food & Beverages Operation; Menu Engineering is a widely used approach in evaluating menus [4].

In principle, Menu reengineering matriculation determines the XY coordinates of a menu item, where in this paper, X is the volume of the menu sold, and Y is the contribution margin. The volume of menus sold is also called popularity, where the popularity index is an index to determine the dividing line between popular and less popular menus. Contribution Margin (CM), in other words, is the difference between the selling price and its cost; while the Contribution Margin Index (CM Index) line is a dividing line drawn from the average margin value contribution; to sort out the menus that have a low CM and those that have a high CM. Another approach to menu engineering is applying the arithmetical formula, as shown in previous works on menu engineering analysis are shown below:

| | | voltes | |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Authors & Year | 19 Method | Advantages | Disadvantages |
| Imam Ardiansyah | The Application of | Applying aritmatical | Step-by-step analysis for |
| (2020) [5] | Menu Engineering | formula, and less | comprehensive learning was |
| | Technique at The Den | computational time | not included and no visual |
| | od Kalaha Restaurant | | matriculation of the menu |
| | 5 Jakarta | | quadrant |
| Asnur (2020) [6] | À la Carte Menu | Applying aritmatical | Step-by-step analysis for |
| | Analysis through Menu | formula, and less | comprehensive learning was |
| | Engineering Method at | computational time | not included and no visual |
| _ | Red Lado Restaurant | | matriculation of the menu |
| 18 | | | quadrant |

Applying tabulated data in identifying CM

versus sales

Missing the arithmetical

formula and no visual

matriculation

| Table | 1. Re | lated V | Nor | ks |
|-------|-------|---------|-----|----|
|-------|-------|---------|-----|----|

47 | ICGTSAVE - VOLUME. 1 NO. 1 TAHUN 2024

Menu Engineering on

Main Course to Increase

Sales

Saraswati, N. K. A.,

et al., (2021) [7]

The menu is vital in Food & Beverages (F&B) operations because it is the basis of the control process [2]. Basically, the Menu Engineering Analysis process utilizes information that is already available to classify menu items into four types [4], namely:

- a. Star menu items that are popular menu items with a high-profit margin
- b. Plough Horses menu items that have low-profit margins but are popular
- c. Puzzles menu items with high-profit margins but not popular
- d. Dogs menu items with low margins and unpopular





way-to-restaurant-profitability)

Jack D. Ninemeier (2018:67) tabulates the menu planner's considerations in structuring the menu. There are at least 21 points that need to be considered in the menu preparation; these considerations are grouped into three points of view of Consumers, Quality, and Taste.

| Pric | rity Concerns of the Menu Pla | nner |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Wants and Needs | Customer | |
| Concept of Value | Quality of Item | Flavor |
| Item Price | Cost | Consistency |
| Object of Property Visit | Availability | Texture/Form/Shape |
| Socioeconomic Factors | Peak Volume Production and Operating Concerns | Nutritional Content |
| Demographic Concerns | Sanitation Concerns | Visual Appeal |
| Ethnic Factors | Layout Concerns | Aromatic Appeal |
| Religious Factors | Equipment Concerns | Temperature |

Figure 12. Priority Concerns of the Menu Planner

Along with the development of technology and the need to perform menu analysis quickly, a digital application has now been developed that can be downloaded and used by restaurant managers. A sample of this technology support is available at the eatapp sites https://restaurant.eatapp.co/free-menu-engineering-excel.

48 ICGTSAVE - VOLUME. 1 NO. 1 TAHUN 2024

MENU ENGINEERING WORKSHEET

| Menu Item | Amount Sold | Menu Price | Food Cost | Food Cost % | ntribution Margin | tal Food Sales | Т | otal Food Cost | Cor | Total tribution Aargin | Contribution Margin % |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|----|-------------------|-----|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | \$ | \$ | \$ | | \$ | | |
| | | | | | \$ - | \$ | \$ | | \$ | | |
| | | | | | \$ - | \$ | \$ | | \$ | | |
| | | | | | \$ | \$ - | \$ | | \$ | | |
| | | | | | \$ - | \$ | \$ | - | \$ | | |
| Total | 0 | | | | | \$ | \$ | | Ś | - | |

Figure 13. Menu Engineering worksheet aetapp (https://restaurant.eatapp.co/free-menuengineering-excel)

MATERIAL & METODOLOGY

Data is collected by observing the menu of Essier Resto of The Vasini Smart Boutique Hotel, grouping them, and reviewing photos and sentences used to entice customers. Secondary data is obtained from printed documents and downloaded from the Point of Sales station of the property management system used at The Vasini. The number of menus listed in the Essier Restaurant menu, is thirty-seven (37) menu items, devided into 8 menu groups. i.e. Appetiser &; Soup; Vasini's Signature; Balinese; Indonesian; Asian &; International; Dessert; Side Order and cook together with chef. For the Cook Together with Chef group, because it only lists the basic ingredients, the author does not include it in the application of this Engineering Menu. Furthermore, the menu sold data that can be downloaded from the Point of Sales system of Essier restaurants is 31 menu items, identified six (6) menu items not included in the menu sold. The unsold menus are: Potatoes Leek Soup, Oxtail Fried Noodles, Urap Sayur, Assorted Jajan Pasar, Assorted Pudding, and Ice Cream. Thus, the menu included in the menu engineering analysis is 31 menu items.

Research Framework



Figure 14. Research Framework

Data analysis is carried out in stages; after the data is collected and grouped, the author computes data with spreadsheets starting from the application of basic formulas, such as determining the mix menu and margins contribution, then continuing with the application of a more complex formula, then ended with conditional formatting. In this study, the data analysis techniques used are Menu Engineering arithmetical and scattered graphical formulas.

Since this study is also dedicated to facilitating the student's learning process, the discussion starts with an understanding that each menu is considered to have the same popularity potential; this means that each menu is expected to sell in equal proportions. Menu engineering assumes an item is popular if its unit sales reach 70 percent of the expected proportions. Thus, the popularity index of a menu item is determined at 70% of the expected popularity in a menu book [2]. For Example: if there are four menu items in a menu book, the popularity index is calculated with the formula of

100%: 4 = 25,

then multiplied by 70%;

 $25 \times 70\% = 17.5;$

therefore, the popularity index is 17.5. any menu items that sold above 17.5 or 18 portions within the determined periods are considered popular.

To facilitate understanding, the author combined the engineering worksheet menu from restaurant.eatapp.co with the menu engineering worksheet of Ninemeir (2018) book of Planning and Control for Food and Beverage Operations.

| | | | | | | | | Date | 6/11 | 390X | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Restaurant: | Terrace Cat | 6 | | | | | | Mee | Period: | Dinner | |
| (A) Menu Item Name | (B) Number Sold (MM) | (C) Menu Mix | (D) Item Food Cost | (E) Item Setting Price | (F) Item CM (E - D) | (G) Menu Costs (B × D) | (H) Menu Revenues (B × E) | (L) Menu CM (H - G) | (P) CM Category | (R) MMNs Category | (5) Manu Item Classification |
| Chicken Dinner | 420 | 42% | \$5.21 | \$7.95 | \$2.74 | \$ 2,188.20 | \$3.339.00 | \$1,150.80 | Low | High | Plowhorse |
| Shrimp Plate | 360 | 36% | 8.50 | 12.50 | 4.00 | 3.060.00 | 4,500.00 | 1,440.00 | High | High | Star |
| Siricin Steak | 150 | | 9.95 | | 4.55 | 1,492.50 | 2,175.00 | 682.50 | High | Low | Puttle |
| Tenderioin Tips | 70 | 7% | 7.00 | 9.45 | 2.45 | 490.00 | 661.50 | 171.50 | LOW | LOW | Dog |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | N | | | | | 1 | 1 | M | | | |
| Column Totals: | 1,000 | | | | | \$7,230.70 | \$10,675.50 | \$3,444.80 | | | |

Figure 15. Menu Engineering Worksheet (Jack D, Ninemeir. 2018:88)

The author's adaptation was limited to column position and column headings write-up to facilitate data computing when it would be used to create scattered graphs. Therefore, the worksheet adaptation that the author will use to analyze the data is as follows:

| | | 6 | | | MENU EN | IGINEE | RING WORK | SHEET | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| | A | в | с | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J | K | F | М | N |
| | Menultem | Amount Sold | Menu Mix | Menu Price | Food Cost | Food Cost % | Contribution Margin | Total Food Sales | Total Food Cost | Total Contribution Margin | Contribution Margin % | CM Category | MM% Category | Menu Items Classification |
| [| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ſ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 16. Adapted Form of Menu Engineering worksheet

The following is a description of the term used in Table 16:

- a. Menu items: are the items contained in the Essier Restaurant menu
- Amount sold: represents the Sales Volume of each menu item; Amount Sold data is obtained from the Essier Restaurant sales report for the period January - December 2022
- c. Menu Mix (Percentage): This compares the Amount Sold per menu item with the total amount sold.
- d. Menu Price: Is the price according to the menu (book of) the Essier Restaurant
- Food Cost: This is the cost of the main ingredients per menu item according to the recipe. Food Cost data obtained from the Essier Restaurant sales report for the period January - December 2019
- Food Cost (Percentage): compares Food Cost per menu item with the Selling Price per menu item.
- g. Contribution Margin: The contribution Margin is compiled from each menu item; the Contribution Margin is obtained from the difference between Menu Price and Food Cost
- h. Total Food Sales: Total Sales From each menu item. Total Food Sales are obtained by multiplying the amount sold by Menu Price.
- i. Total Food Cost is the cost of each menu item multiplied by the amount sold.
- j. Total Contribution Margin: The total margin of each menu item; The total Contribution Margin is obtained by multiplying the amount sold by the Contribution Margin.
- k. Contribution Margin (Percentage): Comparison between the Contribution margin of each menu item and the Total Contribution Margin.
- Contributor Margin Category (CMC): Categorizing Menu Items based on average
 Contribution Margin. CMC is said to be "High" if the Contribution Margin per menu
 item is above the average Contribution Margin; CMC is said to be "Low" if the Contribution Margin per menu item is below the average Contribution Margin
- Menu Mix Category (MMC) is Categorizing menu items based on average Contribution
 Margin. MMC is said to be "High" if the Menu Mix is above the Popularity Index.
 MMC is said to be "Low" if the Menu Mix is below the Popularity Index.

For analytical purposes, each menu is considered to have the same popularity potential; this means that each menu is expected to sell in equal proportions. Menu engineering assumes an item is popular if its unit sales reach 70 percent of the expected proportions. Thus, the popularity index of a menu item is determined at 70% of the expected popularity in a menu book. (Jack D. Ninemeier.2018:85). The Popularity Index formula is given as follow:

$$Popularity \ Index = \frac{\left(\frac{Total \ Amount \ Sold}{Number of \ Menu \ Item} x70\%\right)}{Total \ Amount \ Sold}$$

Menu Item Classification: is the classification of each menu item by pairing the CMC and MMC of each. If CMC and MMC are categorized as "High," then that menu item is classified as STAR. If CMC is categorized as "High" while MMC is categorized as "Low," then menu items are classified as Puzzle. If CMC is categorized as "Low" while MMC is categorized as "High," then menu items are classified as Plow Horse. If CMC and MMC are categorized as "Low," the menu item is classified as DOG. The the data tabulation is then computed to determine the menu classification using conditional formatting to position the data on four quadrant matrices, referred to as Menu Engineering Matrix.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Based on the menu and the obtained data on the Essier restaurant Point of Sales (POS) device, the menu items (MI) grouping can be tabulated as follows:



Figure 17. Tabulation Grouping of Menu Items

52



The application of the Menu Engineering formulation begins with data input to the adapted worksheet wich are column A, B, D and E.

| | A | В | | С | D | | E | F | G |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------------|----|-------------|---------|----|-----------|----------------|------------------------|
| Menu | ltem | Amou Sold | | Menu Mix | Menu Pr | ce | Food Cost | Food Cost % | Contribution Margin |
| Caesar sa ad | | | 61 | | 35.0 | 0 | 7.729 | | |
| Garden salad | | | 43 | | 35.0 | 0 | 7.920 | | |
| Veg Spring roll | | | 81 | | 29.0 | 0 | 10.757 | | |
| Cilok Bak | | | 17 | | 25.0 | 0 | 6.818 | | |
| Nasi goreng Ku | nyit | 2 | 42 | | 68.8 | 0 | 14.992 | | |
| Bebek ba <mark>c</mark> ar Ma | aknyus | | 27 | | 69.8 | 0 | 19.036 | | |
| Nasi Campur ist | timewa | | 29 | | 55.0 | 0 | 17.589 | | |
| Soto Koya | | | 92 | | 59.9 | 0 | 11.651 | | |
| | Fi | gure | 18 | . Tab | ulatio | h | Step 1 | | |

The next step is to determine the value of Menu Mix Percentage (MM%), Food Cost

Percentage (FC%) and Contribution Margin (CM).

• The MM is calculated by the number of MI sold devided by total Menu sold during the

determined perionds which was 3,076; or in the form of the formula

nMM = nB / Total B

Thus, the case of Caesar salad given as

61 / 3,076 = 1.98%.

• The FC% is calculated by comparing Food Cost (E) with Menu Price (D); or in the formula

nF = nE / nD

Thus, the case of Caesar salad

7.729 / 35000 = 22.8%

• The CM is calculated by subtracting Food Cost (E) from Menu Price (D); the case of Caesar salad

35,000 - 7,729 = 27,271

| 5 | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|
| A | В | С | D | E | E | G |
| Menu Item | Amount Sold | Menu Mix | Menu Price | Food Cost | Food Cost % | Contribution Margin |
| Caesarsalad | 61 | 1,98% | 35.000 | 7.729 | 22,08% | 27.271 |
| Garden salad | 43 | 1,40% | 35.000 | 7.920 | 22,63% | 27.080 |
| Veg Spring roll | 81 | 2,63% | 29.000 | 10.757 | 37,09% | 18.243 |
| Cilok Bakso | 17 | 0,55% | 25.000 | 6.818 | 27,27% | 18.182 |
| Nasi goreng Kunyit | 242 | 7,87% | 68.800 | 14.992 | 21,79% | 53.808 |
| Bebek bakar Maknyus | 27 | 0,88% | 69.800 | 19.036 | 27,27% | 50.764 |
| Nasi Campur istimewa | 29 | 0,94% | 55.000 | 17.589 | 31,98% | 37.411 |
| Soto Koya | 92 | 2,99% | 59.900 | 11.651 | 19,45% | 48.249 |



The next stage is to determine Total Food Sales (Σ S), Total Food Cost (Σ C), Total Contribution Margin and Contribution Margin percentage (CM%), using the case of Caesar Salad.

| A | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J | K |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Menuitem | Amount Sold | Menu Mix | 4 Menu Price | Food Cost | Food Cost% | Contribution Margin | Total Food Sales | Total Food Cost | Total Contribution Margin | Contribution Margin % |
| Cæsarsalad | 61 | 1,98% | 35.000 | 7.729 | 22,08% | 27.271 | | | | |
| Garden salad | 43 | 1,40% | 35.000 | 7.920 | 22,63% | 27.080 | | | | |
| Veg Spring roll | 81 | 2,63% | 29.000 | 10.757 | 37,09% | 18.243 | | | | |
| Cilok Bakso | 17 | Q,55% | 25.000 | 6.818 | 27,27% | 18.182 | | | | |
| Nasi goreng Kunyi t | 242 | 7,87% | 68.800 | 14.992 | 21,79% | 53.808 | | | | |
| Bebek bakar Maknyus | 27 | 0,88% | 69.800 | 19.036 | 27,27% | 50.764 | | | | |
| Nasi Campuristime wa | 29 | 0,94% | 55.000 | 17.589 | 31,98% | 37.411 | | | | |
| Soto Koya | 92 | 2,99% | 59.900 | 11.651 | 19,45% | 48.249 | | | | |

Figure 20. Tabulation Step 3

a. ΣS is calculated by multiplying the amount Sold by Menu Price or in the formula

 $nH = nB \times nD$

Thus

- $61 \times 35,000 = 2,135,000$
- b. The ΣC is calculated by multiplying the amount Sold by Food Cost or in the formula

 $nI = nD \times nE$

Thus

 $61 \times 7,729 = 471,469$

 c. The ΣCM is calculated by multiplying the amount Sold by the Contribution Margin or in the formula

 $nJ = nD \times nG$

Thus

- 61 × 27,271 = 1,663,531
- d. The CM% is calculated by comparing the Contribution Margin with Menu Price, or in the formula

nK = nG / nD

Thus

```
27.271 / 35.000 = 77.92%
```

| A | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J | K |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Menu Item | Amount Sold | Menu Mix | 4 Menu Price | Food Cost | Food Cost % | Contribution Margin | Total Food Sales | Total Food Cost | Total Contribution Margin | Contribution Margin % |
| Caesar sal ad | 61 | 1,98% | 35.000 | 7.729 | 22,08% | 27.271 | 2.135.000 | 471.469 | 1.663.531 | 77,92% |
| Garden salad | 43 | 1,40% | 35.000 | 7.920 | 22,63% | 27.080 | 1.505.000 | 340.560 | 1.164.440 | 77,37% |
| VegSpringroll | 81 | 2,63% | 29.000 | 10.757 | 37,09% | 18.243 | 2.349.000 | 871.317 | 1.477.683 | 62,91% |
| Cilok Bakso | 17 | 0,55% | 25.000 | 6.818 | 27,27% | 18.182 | 425.000 | 115.906 | 309.094 | 72,73% |
| Nasi goreng Kunyit | 242 | 7,87% | 68.800 | 14.992 | 21,79% | 53.808 | 16.649.600 | 3.628.064 | 13.021.536 | 78,21% |
| Bebek bakar Maknyus | 27 | 0,88% | 69.800 | 19.036 | 27,27% | 50.764 | 1.884.600 | 513.972 | 1.370.628 | 72,73% |
| Nasi Campuristimewa | 29 | 0,94% | 55.000 | 17.589 | 31,98% | 37.411 | 1.595.000 | 510.081 | 1.084.919 | 68,02% |
| Soto Koya | 92 | 2,99% | 59.900 | 11.651 | 19,45% | 48.249 | 5.510.800 | 1.071.892 | 4.438.908 | 80,55% |

Figure 21. Tabulation Step 4

Tabulation and computation of data up to these steps are able to show an overview of the position or classification of menus in the form of numbers, as follows:

| | | Menultem | Am ount Sold | Menu Mix | 4 Menu Price | Food Cost | Food Cost % | Contribution Margin | Total Food Sales | Total Food Cost | Total Contribution Margin | Contribution Margin % |
|--------------|----|---|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | Caesar salad | 61 | 1,98% | 35.000 | 7.729 | 22,08% | 27.271 | 2.135.000 | 471.469 | 1663.531 | 77,92% |
| Appetise & | 2 | Garden salad | 43 | 1,40% | 35.000 | 7.920 | 22,63% | 27.080 | 1505.000 | 340.560 | 1164.440 | 77,37% |
| Soup | 3 | Veg Spring roll | 81 | 2,63% | 29.000 | 10.757 | 37,09% | 18.243 | 2.349.000 | 871.317 | 1477.683 | 62,91% |
| | 4 | Cilok Bakso | 17 | 0,55% | 25.000 | 6.818 | 27,27% | 18.182 | 425.000 | 115.906 | 309.094 | 72,73% |
| | 5 | Nasi goreng Kunyit | 242 | 7,87% | 68.800 | 14.992 | 21,79% | 53.808 | 16.649.600 | 3.628.064 | 13.021.536 | 78,21% |
| Sinature | 6 | Bebek bakar Maknyus | 27 | 0,88% | 69.800 | 19.036 | 27,27% | 50.764 | 1.884.600 | 513.972 | 1370.628 | 72,73% |
| Sinature | 7 | Nasi Campur istimewa | 29 | 0,94% | 55.000 | 17.589 | 31,98% | 37.411 | 1595.000 | 510.081 | 1.084.919 | 68,02% |
| | 8 | Soto Koya | 92 | 2,99% | 59.900 | 11.651 | 19,45% | 48.249 | 5.510.800 | 1071892 | 4.438.908 | 80,55% |
| | 9 | Bebek goren g Garing | 108 | 3,35% | 75.000 | 27.145 | 36,19% | 47.854 | 7.725.000 | 2,796.038 | 4.928.962 | 63,81% |
| Balinese | 30 | Bebek Nyat nyat | 30 | 0.98% | 75.000 | 25.465 | 33.95% | 49.535 | 2,250.000 | 763.950 | 1.486.050 | 66.05% |
| Balinese | 11 | Ayam panggang Sambal Matah | 185 | 6,01% | 48.000 | 10.063 | 20,95% | 37.937 | 8.880.000 | 1861655 | 7.018.345 | 79,04% |
| | 12 | Gerang asem ayam | 51 | 1,66% | 45.000 | 14.410 | 32,02% | 30.590 | 2.295.000 | 734.910 | 1560.090 | 67,98% |
| | 13 | Nasi Goreng | 1120 | 35,41% | 45.000 | 9.790 | 21,76% | 35.210 | 50.400.000 | 10.964.800 | 39.435.200 | 78,24% |
| | 14 | SopBuntut | 156 | 5.07% | 65.000 | 23.329 | 35.89% | 41671 | 10.140.000 | 3,639,324 | 6500.676 | 64.11% |
| | 15 | Ayamlalapan | 69 | 2,24% | 45.000 | 14.297 | 31,77% | 30.708 | 3.105.000 | 986.493 | 2.118.507 | 68,23% |
| Indonesian | 16 | Mie Kuah ayam | 303 | 9.85% | 45.000 | 9.768 | 21.71% | 35.232 | 13.635.000 | 2,959,704 | 10.675.296 | 78.29% |
| | 17 | Mie Goreng | 163 | 5.30% | 45.000 | 9.790 | 21,76% | 35.210 | 7.335.000 | 1595.770 | 5,739,230 | 78,24% |
| | 18 | Gado-gado | 15 | 0.49% | 35.000 | 12.386 | 35,39% | 22.614 | 525.000 | 185,790 | 339.210 | 64.61% |
| | 19 | Tom vam fish | 150 | 4.88% | 40.000 | 11.418 | 28.55% | 28.582 | 6.000.000 | 1712.700 | 4.287.300 | 71,45% |
| | 20 | Chicken Teriyaki | 36 | 1,17% | 45.000 | 12.272 | 27,27% | 32,728 | 1620.000 | 441.792 | 1178.208 | 72,73% |
| | 21 | Capcav | 49 | 159% | 32.000 | 11.366 | 35.52% | 20.634 | 1568.000 | 556.934 | 1011.066 | 64.48% |
| Asian & Intl | 22 | Beef Burger | 151 | 4.91% | 45.000 | 16.630 | 36,96% | 28370 | 6.795.000 | 2511130 | 4.283.870 | 63.04% |
| | 23 | Club Sandwich | 120 | 3.90% | 45.000 | 9.790 | 21.76% | 35,210 | 5,400,000 | 1174.800 | 4,225,200 | 78.24% |
| | 24 | Calamary Salt pepper | 74 | 2.41% | 48.000 | 15.317 | 31 91% | 32.683 | 3552.000 | 1133.458 | 2.418 542 | 68.09% |
| | 25 | Fish& Chip | 151 | 4.91% | 55.000 | 18.138 | 32.98% | 36.862 | 8305.000 | 2,738,838 | 5 566 162 | 67.02% |
| | 26 | Pisang Goreng | 184 | 5.98% | 25.000 | 5,720 | 22.88% | 19,280 | 4600.000 | 1052.480 | 3547.520 | 77.12% |
| | 27 | FreashFruit | 51 | 1,66% | 20.000 | 5,720 | 28.60% | 14,280 | 1020.000 | 291720 | 728.280 | 71.40% |
| Dessert | 28 | Apple Pie Roll | Z | 0.81% | 30.000 | 9038 | 30.13% | 20.962 | 750.000 | 225,950 | 524.050 | 69.87% |
| | 29 | Chocolate lava | 13 | 0.42% | 35.000 | 9545 | 27,27% | 25.455 | 455.000 | 124.085 | 330.915 | 72,73% |
| | 30 | Steam Rice | 105 | 3.41% | 15.000 | 1320 | 8.80% | 13.680 | 1575.000 | 138.600 | 1436.400 | 91.20% |
| Sides Order | 31 | French Fries | 300 | 9,75% | 25.000 | 9.783 | 39.13% | 15,217 | 7.500.000 | 2,934,900 | 4565.100 | 60.87% |
| | | Total | 4.196 | 4131 | 44.682 | 11.689 | 26,16% | 32.992 | 187.484.000 | 49.049.082 | 138.434.918 | 73,84% |
| | | Average Con tribution Margin Average volume Sold Popularity Index | 32.992 108 72 | 2,33% | | | | | | | | |

Figure 22. Tabulation Step 5

Steps 6 is determining CM Category, MM% Category and Menu Items Classification.

There are two techniques that will be applied to these three things. The first is a *spreadsheet formulation technique table*, and the second technique is using *Scattered Charts*.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---|
| A | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н |) |) | K | L | М | N | |
| Menultem | Amount Sold | Menu Mix | Menu Priœ | Food Cost | Food Cost % | 9 Contribution Margin | Total Food Sales | Total Food Cost | Total Contribution Margin | Contribution Margin % | OM Category | MM% Category | Menu Iter Classificati | |
| Caesar salad | 61 | 1,98% | 35.000 | 7.729 | 22,08% | 27.271 | 2.135.000 | 471.499 | 1.663.531 | 77,92% | | | | |
| Garden salad | 43 | 1,40% | 35.000 | 7.920 | 22,63% | 27.080 | 1.505.000 | 340.560 | 1.164.440 | 77,37% | | | | |
| VegSpring roll | 81 | 2,63% | 29.000 | 10.757 | 37,09% | 18.243 | 2.349.000 | 871.317 | 1.477.683 | 62,91% | | | | |
| Cilok Bakso | 17 | 0,55% | 25.000 | 6.818 | 27,27% | 18.182 | 425.000 | 115.906 | 309.094 | 72,73% | | | | |
| Nasi goreng Kunyit | 242 | 7,87% | 68.800 | 14,992 | 21,7% | 53.808 | 16.649.600 | 3.628.064 | 13.021.536 | 78,21% | | | | |
| Bebek bakar Maknyus | 27 | 0,88% | 69.800 | 19.086 | 27,27% | 90.764 | 1.884.600 | 513.972 | 1.370.628 | 72,73% | | | | |
| Nasi Campuristimewa | 29 | 0,94% | 55.000 | 17.589 | 31,98% | 37.411 | 1.595.000 | 510.081 | 1.084.919 | 68,02% | | | | |
| Soto Koya | 92 | 2,99% | 59.900 | 11651 | 19,45% | 48.249 | 5.510.800 | 1.071.892 | 4.438.908 | 80,55% | | | | |



In this stage, we will determine the CM category and MM% category. The author chooses to use a set of the following icons:

- High Approximate
 - App Low

8

55 ICGTSAVE - VOLUME. 1 NO. 1 TAHUN 2024

The *CM Category* is determined by calculating the value of the Average contribution margin (*ACM*) first, the way to calculate it is by deviding the Total CM with the number of menus sold or in the formula:

$$ACM = \Sigma J / \Sigma B$$

ACM = 138,434,918 / 4196

ACM = 32,992

This ACM is borderline, which means that if the CM of a menu item is equal to or greater than 32,992, it will fall into the "High" category; if it is smaller than 32,992 and equal to or greater than 32,000 will belong to the "Approximate" category, while those smaller than 32,000 will belong to the "Low" category. This parameter is set through the Conditional Formatting menu in the Excel spreadsheet program.

In determining the popularity of the menu, based on the compiled data, there is one menu that is too dominant, which is Fried Rice, with a gap of more than three times that of the others; the author decided not to Include the number of sold fried rice in the total number of menu items sold so that the popularity index becomes realistic. Based on the compiled data, there is one menu that is too dominant, which is Fried Rice, with a gap of more than three times that of the others, the author decided not to Include the number of sold fried rice in the total number of menu items sold, so that the popularity index becomes more realistic. The first step is to find the average volume sold, i.e., by dividing the total volume sold by the number of menus. In the case of this study, the amount of Fried Rice sold was deducted first from the total menu sold:

4,196 - 1,120 = 3,076.

Because Nasi Goreng is not included, the number of menu items becomes 30, and therefore, Average Volume Sold (AVS) is calculated by the formula:

AVS = (Total Amount sold – Amount sold fried rice) / 30

AVS = (4,196 - 1,120) / 30

AVS = 3,076 / 30 = 103.

Provided that the popularity index is 70%, then 103 x 70% = 72; or in percentage becomes 72: 3,076 = 2.33%. Thus, the author uses 2.33% as the Popularity Index (PI). If the PI of a menu item is equal to or greater than 2.33%, it will be in the high category; If it is smaller than 2.33% and equal to or greater than 2.28% it will belong to the close category, while those smaller than 2.28 will belong to the low category. Furthermore, this parameter is set through the Conditional Formatting menu on the excel program worksheet.

After doing conditional formatting on the worksheet, the Contribution Margin Value is entered into the CM Category column and the Mix Menu is entered into the MM% Category column.

Scattered Chart sonsidered as the simplest technique where the Absis is the volume sol or popularity and the ordinat is the contribution margin. The results can be seen on the following table:



Table 24. Completed Engineering Worksheet Menu



Figure 25. Menu Engineering Matrix - Classification

Discussion

The number of menus listed in the Essier Restaurant menu, is thirty-seven (37) menu items, devided into 8 menu groups. i.e., Appetiser &; Soup; Vasini's Signature; Balinese; Indonesian; Asian &; International; Dessert; Side Order and cook together with chef. For the Cook Together with Chef group, because it only lists the basic ingredients, the author does not include it in the application of this Engineering Menu. Furthermore, the menu sold data that can be downloaded from the Point of Sales system of Essier restaurants is 31 menu items, identified six (6) menu items not included in the menu sold. The unsold menus are: Potatoes Leek Soup, Oxtail Fried Noodles, Urap Sayur, Assorted Jajan Pasar, Assorted Pudding, and Ice Cream. Thus, the menu included in the menu engineering analysis is 31 menu items.

From the data analysis that has been carried out, it is obtained that the menu items classified according to the results of the Menu Engineering Matrix are as follows:

- a. The STAR category consists of ten (10) menus or 3 2.26% of the entire menu, consisting of: Fried Rice, Turmeric Fried Rice; Chicken noodle soup; Sambal Matah Chicken; fried noodles; Tail Soup, Fish & Chips; Club Sandwitch; Crispy Fried Duck and Soto Koya.
- b. The Puzzle category consists of hree (3) menu or 9.68% of the entire menu, namely: Maknyus Duck; Nyat-nyat duck; Special Mixed Rice.
- c. The Plough Horse category consists of seven (7) menus or 22.58% of the entire menu, namely: French Fires; fried bananas; Beef Burger; Tom Yam Fish; Steam Rice, Calamary, Salt & Pepper, and Spring Roll.
- d. The Dog category, consisting of eleven (1 1) m enu or 35.48% of the entire menu, namely: Chicken Teriyaki; Chicken Racing; Green Salads; Caesar Salads, Chocolate Lava; A hodgepodge; Capcay; Apple Pie; Bakso Cilok and Fresh Fruit



Figure 26. Classification Pie Chart menu

Menus classified into the STAR quadran are menus that can make the best contribution, this quadran identifies that menus included in this classification have contribution margins above ACM and have popularity above the Popularity Index (PI). The menus that need attention are those classified as Plough Horse, Puzzle and Dog. The menu classified as Plough Horse is a popular menu that has the potential to increase the value of its contribution margin or selling price to shift towards Star. Menus that are classified as Puzzle, are menus that are less popular, but have contribution margins above average, these menus have the potential to become stars with the application of suggestive selling techniques, point of internal merchandising or other promotional techniques. The menu in this Puzzle classification can also be pushed to plough horse first by lowering the contribution margin, then after popularity the contribution margin can be increased again to become a Star.

Meanwhile, the menu classified in the Dog quadrant is a menu that has the potential to increase its popularity by sharing ways, encouraged to become a pough horse first, to then be able to become a Star or be considered for updated recipes, even replaced if deemed necessary. Here is a discussion of Essier restaurants in diagram form.



Figure 27. Discussion Diagram

CONCLUSION

Using the arithmetical and scattered charting technique, the Menu Engineering analysis of Essier restaurants can map each menu item's position into four Menu Engineering Matrix quadrans. From the arithmetical formula application, it was identified that 35.48% of the menu items were in the Dog classification, Star 32.26%, Plough Horse 22.58%, and Puzzle 9.68%.

Menus that need attention are menus that belong to puzzles, plow horses, and especially dogs. The dog menu category has the potential to increase popularity by pushing it into the plow horse category first to then become a Star or be considered for updated recipes, even replaced if deemed necessary.

SUGGESTION

Reviewing the Menu Engineering Matrix, the menu in the Puzzle classification, especially those close to the popularity index line, applying suggestive selling techniques, internal merchandising, or other promotional techniques, can be pushed to become a Star. Menus in the Plough Horse quadrant and away from the ACM line may be considered for increased contribution margin value. Menus in the DOG quadrant close to the popularity index line can be promoted to be pushed to Plough Horse, while menus far from PI and ACM can be considered for replacement. Essier Restaurant Management is recommended to regularly conduct menu engineering analysis to determine strategies and steps to increase restaurant sales and profitability. The menu engineering method is also very useful in ensuring that the menu available in the restaurant is popular and has a good contribution margin. Future research is expected to analyze the factors causing a menu's high or low popularity.

REFERENCES

- Ardiansyah, I. (2020). The application of menu engineering technique in determining marketing strategy at the Den of Kalaha Restaurant Jakarta. Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship, 8(1), 18-39.
- CHA Certification Study Guide. (2018). Copyright 2008 by The American Hotel & Lodging Educational Institute, 800 N. Magnolia, Suite 300 Orlando, FL 32803 USA.

16

Cichy, R. F., & Hickey, P. J. (2012). Managing service in food and beverage operations. American Hotel & Lodging Educational Institute.

14

Fernando, W., & Asnur, L. (2021). Tingkat profitabilitas menu melalui metode menu engineering di Satoo Restaurant Hw Hotel Padang. Jurnal Pariwisata Bunda, 1(2), 19-32.

James, R. A. (2012). Hospitality sales and marketing. Prentice Hall.

Kasavana, M. L., Smith, D. I., & Schmidgall, R. S. (1990). Menu engineering: A practical guide to menu analysis (Rev. ed.).

15

Ninemeier, J. D., & Kasavana, M. L. (1986). Planning and control for food and beverage operations. Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Motel Association.

Saraswati, N. K. A., Bagiastuti, N. K., Elistyawati, I. A., & Sudiarta, M. (2020). Menu engineering on main course to increase sales. International Journal of Glocal Tourism, 1(1), 51-60.

Valen, J. J. (1987). CHA; James R. Abbey Ph.D, CHA.

| ORIGINALITY REPORT | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 1 SIMIL/ | 2% ARITY INDEX | 10% INTERNET SOURCES | 3% PUBLICATIONS | 6% STUDENT PAPE | RS | | |
| PRIMAF | RY SOURCES | | | | | | |
| 1 | icgtsave Internet Sour | e.stipram.ac.id | | | 2% | | |
| 2 | WWW.ijO Internet Sour | smas.org | | | 1% | | |
| 3 | Submitt Student Pape | <mark>ed to Mont Blar</mark> | nc Palace | | 1% | | |
| 4 | WWW.re | stohub.org ^{ce} | | | 1% | | |
| 5 | ejourna Internet Sour | l.akparbundapa | dang.ac.id | | 1% | | |
| 6 | Submitt Student Pape | ed to William Ar | ngliss Institute | of TAFE | 1% | | |
| 7 | Submitt Student Pape | ed to Johnson a | nd Wales Univ | ersity < | <1% | | |
| 8 | Submitt Student Pape | ed to University | of West Lond | on < | <1% | | |
| 9 | Submitt Student Pape | ed to Johnson 8 | Wales | < | < 1 % | | |

| 10 dergipark.org.tr Internet Source | <1 % |
|--|--------------------|
| 11 jurnal.btp.ac.id Internet Source | <1 % |
| 12 media.neliti.com Internet Source | <1% |
| 13 baixardoc.com Internet Source | <1 % |
| 14 repository.upi.edu Internet Source | <1 % |
| 15 www.igi-global.com Internet Source | <1% |
| 16 www.haaga-helia.fi Internet Source | <1 % |
| 17 epubs.scu.edu.au Internet Source | <1% |
| 18 Submitted to University College Birming Student Paper | ^{ham} <1% |
| 19 Submitted to Sheffield Hallam University Student Paper | × <1% |
| 20 WWW.ijcoe.org Internet Source | <1 % |
| 21 staging.hotel-online.com | <1 % |



| Exclude quotes | Off | Exclude matches | Off |
|----------------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| Exclude bibliography | Off | | |