# FROZEN PROCESSED FISH AND SHELLFISH

# CONSUMPTION IN

# INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC EATING PLACES

## Atlanta, Georgía

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

CIRCULAR 67

United States Department of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, Secretary

Fish and Wildlife Service, Arnie J. Suomela, Commissioner Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Donald L. McKernan, Director

INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC EATING PLACES are among the best of all potential markets for frozen fishery products. In recognition of this, a survey was undertaken to obtain information on the consumption of frozen processed fish and shellfish in these establishments.

This study was conducted in ten selected cities by Crossley, S-D Surveys, Inc., of New York City in order to obtain information which could be used by the fishing industry to increase consumer demand for fishery products. The data obtained for each city as a result of this survey, together with an explanation of the methods and procedures used, are published in a series as follows:

> Circular 66 - Survey Methods and Procedures Circular 67 - Atlanta, Georgia Circular 68 - Chicago, Illinois Circular 69 - Cleveland, Ohio Circular 70 - Denver, Colorado Circular 71 - Houston, Texas Circular 72 - Los Angeles, California Circular 73 - New York, New York Circular 74 - Omaha, Nebraska Circular 75 - Portland, Oregon Circular 76 - Springfield, Massachusetts

This project was financed from funds provided by the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act to increase production and markets for the domestic fishing industry.

These publications are available upon request from the Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

## FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

## AND SHELLFISH CONSUMPTION

## IN INSTITUTIONS

## AND

## PUBLIC EATING PLACES

------

## ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Prepared in the Division of Industrial Research and Services

Branch of Market Development

CIRCULAR 67

WASHINGTON - NOVEMBER 1959

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table		Page
	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	1 - 5
	DETAILED FINDINGS	
1	Did the Establishment Buy Sea Food in the Preceding	
	Twelve Months?	6
2	Did the Establishment Buy Frozen Processed Sea Food	
2	in the Preceding Twelve Months?	7
3	Frozen Processed Fish Bought in November, 1958	0 0
4	How Processed Before Purchase	8 - 9
-1	Quantity of Frozen Processed Fish Bought in November, 1958	10
5	Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with Prepreparation of Frozen	
	Processed Fish	11
6	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Quality and Condition of	
	Frozen Processed Fish	12
7	Package Sizes of Frozen Processed Fish Bought in	
	November, 1958 and Average Number of Servings	
	Per Pound	12
8	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Types and Sizes of	
	Frozen Processed Fish Packages	13
9	Percentage of Frozen Processed Fish Served Fried,	
1.0	Broiled, Baked, and in Other Ways	13
10	Frozen Processed Shellfish Bought in November, 1958	
11	How Processed Before Purchase	14
11	Quantity of Frozen Processed Shellfish Bought in	
	November, 1958	15

## Page

12	Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with Prepreparation of	
12	Frozen Processed Shellfish	16
13	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Quality and	
	Condition of Frozen Processed Shellfish	16
14	Package Sizes of Frozen Processed Shellfish Bought	
	in November, 1958 and Average Number of Servings	
	Per Pound	17 - 18
15	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Types and Sizes	1. 10
	of Frozen Processed Shellfish Packages	19
16	Percentage of Frozen Processed Shellfish Served	
	Fried, Broiled, Baked and in Other Ways	19
17	Types of Portions Bought in November, 1958	20
18	Quantity of Portions Bought in November, 1958	20
19	Amount of Portions Bought by Establishments, as	20
	Compared to the Previous Year	21
20	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Quality and	21
	Condition of Portions	21
		21
21	Is the Quality of Portions Better than that of other	
	Frozen Processed Fish - For What Reasons?	22
22	Advantages of Using Portions	$\frac{-1}{22}$
23	Disadvantages of Using Portions	23
24	Do Establishments Think Customers Prefer Portions	20
	to Other Frozen Processed Fish - For What	
	Reasons?	23
		20

## Page

25	Average Weight of Portions and Average Number of	
24	Servings Per Package	24
26	Satisfaction with the Size of Portions in a Package	24
27	Percentage of Portions Served Fried, Broiled,	
	Baked, and in Other WaysBaked, and in Other Ways	25
28	Do Establishments Cook Portions While Still Frozen?	26
29	Cost of Using Portions, as Compared to Other Frozen	
	Processed Fish and Reasons Why Portions are	
	Thought More or Less Expensive	26
30	When Ordering Portions from Suppliers, Do Establishments	20
	Specify the Kind of Fish?	
31	Would the Establishments Like to Have Other Portion	27
	Controlled Sea Food Items Not Now Available?	27
32	Reasons Establishments Did Not Buy Portions During	21
	November, 1958	
		28
32	Was Price a Reason Establishments Did Not Buy Portions?	28
33	Types of Supplier Providing Frozen Processed Sea Food	20
	to Establishments	29
34	Distance of Establishment from Main Supplier of Frozen	49
	Processed Sea Food	
35	Frequency of Deliveries of Frozen Processed Sea Food	30
36	- •	31
50	Can Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food Improve	
	Services to Establishments?	32

## Page

Amount Spent for Frozen Processed Sea Food During Preceding Twelve Months	0.0
Profitability to Establishments of Frozen Processed	33
	34
	35
Do the Establishments Buy Government Inspected or	
	36
or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food	37
Has Government Inspection Affected the Amount of	
	38
If Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed	50
	38
Previous Use of Frozen Processed Sea Food by	30
Nonusers and Reasons for Stopping Use or	
	39
for Keeping Frozen Processed Sea Food?	
According to Type of Establishment and	
	40
Using Frozen Processed Sea Food	41
	<ul> <li>Preceding Twelve Months.</li> <li>Profitability to Establishments of Frozen Processed Sea Food and Other High Protein Foods</li> <li>Do the Establishments Know they can buy Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food?</li> <li>Do the Establishments Buy Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food?</li> <li>Reasons Establishments Buy Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food</li> <li>Has Government Inspection Affected the Amount of Frozen Processed Sea Food Bought by the Establishments ?</li></ul>

## DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

a	Total Receipts from Meals Served During 1957 or	
	Last Fiscal Year	42
b	Amount Establishments Spent for Food During	
	Previous Twelve Months	43
с	Percentage of Total Operating Cost Spent for	10
	Food in Previous Twelve Months	44
d	Average Number of Meals Served by Establishments	45
		10
е	Average Price Per Meal Served	46
f	Number of Regular Employees Engaged in Preparing	
	and Serving Food	47
g	Seating Capacity of Establishments	47
h	Number of Days of the Week on Which Establishments	1.
	Serve Meals	48
i	Percentage of Establishments Serving Specialized Types	
	of Food	49
		τŲ

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

#### (A†lanta)

#### A. Use of Frozen Processed Sea Food (Tables 1, 2)

Four fifths of all the establishments in Atlanta said they bought sea food in the previous twelve months. Among buyers of sea food, the great majority said they made purchases if sea food in the <u>frozen proc</u>essed form.

Fifty-six per cent of all the establishments said they had bought <u>frozen processed fish</u> in November, 1958; 46 per cent said they had bought <u>frozen processed shell-</u><u>fish</u>; and 27 per cent said they had bought <u>pertion</u>.

Among institutions (such as schools and hospital), the incidence of use of frozen processed sea food was greater than among public eating places.

Of the ten cities in the survey, Atlanta rank-d second, in terms of the percentage of all establishments buying frozen processed sea food.

## B. <u>Frozen Processed Fish - Purchases</u>, <u>Attitudes</u>, <u>and Practices</u>

1. Purchases: Species and Amount of Prepreparation (Tables 3, 4)

More than two thirds of the users of frozen processed fish bought ocean perch fillets during November, 1958. This was the most popular of the frozen processed fish items served in this area.

Haddock fillets were also bought in large quantities by many establishments in Atlanta.

Ocean perch fillets were bought widely and in substantial quantities in the Southern and Middle Western cities included in the survey, while haddock fillets were popular purchases in Omaha, Springfield and Cleveland.

2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation and Quality and Condition of Fish (Tables 5, 6)

A great majority of Atlanta purchasers were satisfied with the present prepreparation of fish, and with the quality and condition of the fish.

This was generally true for the ten cities included in the survey.

3. Packaging of Fish (Tables 7, 8)

Atlanta establishments most typically bought frozen processed fish in 5 pound packages. Mackerel fillets were an exception, with 10 pound packages the most popular size for this item.

4. <u>Methods of Preparing and Serving Fish</u> (Table 9)

> Frying was the most popular method of preparing fish among Atlanta establishments. The average establishment served 71 per cent of its fish fried. Frying was the leading method in all ten cities of the study.

- Attitudes, and Practices
  - 1. Purchases: Sie les and Type of Prepreparation (Tables 10, 11)

More than half if the **frozen** processed snellfish users in Atlanta bought breaded shrimp in November,  $1^{(\mu)}$ . A third of the establishments bought raw chrimp.

Raw lobster, however, led in Atlanta in terms of total quantity purchased.

Breaded shrimp and raw shrimp were bought widely and in large quantities in all of the cities included in the study.

2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation: Toward Quality and Condition of Shellfish (Tables 12, 14)

All but a few purchasers were satisfied with the present prepreparation of shellfish, and with the quality and condition of the shillfish which they bought.

The same held generally true for the other cities in the survey.

3. Packaging of Shellfish (Tables 14, 15)

As with fish, shellfish was most frequently bought in 5 pound packages in Atlanta.

4. <u>Methods of Preparing and Serving Shellfish</u> (Table 16)

Frying was the most popular way of preparing shellfish in Atlanta. The typical established to be ved three quarters of its shellfish fried. with flich, friend the least of method of preshellfish in a ten citled of the study.

- D. <u>Friin Pontriled Sea Food Purchases</u>, Attitudes, and Practices
  - 1. <u>Purchases: Type of Prepreparation</u> (Tables 1, 17, 18, 19)

More than a fourth of all the establishments in Atlanta bought portions during November, 1958.

As with frozen processed sea food in general, Atlanta ranked second in percentage of establishments buying portions.

In Atlanta, portions which were uncookedbreaded and uncooked-plain were the leading items in terms of the percentage of establishments using them. In terms of quantity purchased uncooked-breaded portions ranked first.

Three fourths of the purchasers of portions said that they were currently buying about the same amount of portions as the year before. Thirteen per cent said they were buying more, and 4 per cent said they were buying less.

2. Attitudes Toward Portions (Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, 24)

Nearly all establishments said they were satisfied with the quality and condition of portions.

About a quarter of the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was better than that of other frozen processed fish. More than 60 per cent rated the quality as about the same, while 5 per cent considered the quality poorer.

Major advantages cited for portions included:

	% of Users Citing
Size of portions, uniform portions	36
Convenience, ease of preparation	34
Economy, no waste	25
Fast, timesaving	20
Can control food costs better -	
know profit	16

About 30 per cent of the users cited some disadvantage to using portions. The most frequently mentioned disadvantage was that portions are not economical.

Users of portions generally thought their customers liked portions as well as other types of frozen processed fish, with fewer than 3 per cent indicating that their customers liked portions less than other types of frozen processed sea food.

#### 3. Packaging of Portions (Tables 25, 26)

Atlanta purchasers tended to buy portions in larger packages than purchasers in other cities. The <u>average</u> weight of a package of portions for the city was 7.6 pounds.

They also tended to buy individual portions of larger size, and the <u>average</u> weight of an individual portion was 5.1 ounces.

Almost all establishme's, in Atlanta and the other nime cities, said they were satisfied with the size of portions in the packages.

#### 4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Portions (Tables 27, 28)

Frying was the most widely used method of preparing and serving portions with 86 per cent of the establishments serving them this way. The average establishment served 65 per cent of its portions fried.

Frying was the leading method in nine of the ten cities of the study, the single exception being Springfield, Massachusetts, where baking was the most popular method of preparation. In Atlanta, the average establishment served 12 per cent of its portions broiled and 16 per cent baked.

Almost three fourths of the Atlanta establishments using portions cooked them while frozen.

5. Cost of Using Portions (Table 29)

Only a sixth of the establishments using portions said they were more expensive than other forms of frozen processed fish. A large majority of users considered them less expensive, or rated them about the same.

#### 6. <u>Miscellaneous Findings About Portions</u> (Tables 30, 31)

Virtually all Atlanta establishments said they specified the kind of fish when ordering portions.

Fewer than 2 per cent of the users suggested

any new portion items, not now available, which they would like to have.

#### 7. Nonusers of Portions (Table 32)

Establishments which used frozen processed sea food, but not portions, gave a number of reasons for not buying portions: portions were too expensive, they served other types of fish, or they sold comparatively little fish.

Price also figure: as a reason for not buying portions in Denver, Los Angeles, and Portland. It was less important as a reason in the other six cities of the survey.

#### E. Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food (Tables 23, 34, 35, 36)

Establishments in Atlanta tended to buy frozen processed sea food from sea food wholesalers, usually less than ten miles away, to have it delivered once a week, and to be satisfied with the services of the suppliers.

Sea food wholesalers supplied 72 per cent of the establishments, while frozen food distributors accounted for another 20 per cent.

Main suppliers were located less than ten miles from the establishment, in  $7^{\rm g}$  per cent of the cases.

In almost half the cases, deliveries were made once a week, while deliveries were made from two to four times a week in about a quarter of the establishments.

Only a small fraction of the purchasers said they could think of ways in which the suppliers could improve their services. F. Expenditures for Frozen Pricessed Sea Food; Its Printability (Tables 17, 38)

A third of the establishments reporting in Atlanta said that they spent less than \$250 for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twelve months. The figures ranged upward to \$100,000 and over, with the median coming at \$450.

Five eighths of the profit-making establish ents which expressed an opinion, considered frozen processed sea food more profitable than other high protein foods.

#### G. <u>Government Inspection of Frozen Processed Sea</u> Food - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes (Tables 39, 40, 41, 42)

All but 15 per cent of the establishments in Atlanta were aware that they could buy frozen processed sea food, which had been inspected or graded by the United States Government.

Of those who were unaware, a small number said they would buy more sea food if Government inspected sea food were available. Most said either that they did not know or would buy about the same amount.

Of the establishments aware that they could buy Government inspected or graded sea food, almost all had bought some. When purchasers were asked if the inspection had affected the amount of frozen processed sea food which they bought, t per cent said the inspection had caused them to buy more.

#### H. Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food; Cold Storage Facilities (Tables 43, 44, 45)

Most nonusers in Atlanta said they had never bought frozen processed sea food with the main reason given being that they sold little or no fish. About one sixth of the Atlanta establishments who never had used frozen processed sea food said that they did not have suitable cold storage facilities. In other cities, though, this reason was not often given.

Findings regarding cold storage facilities among nonusers in Atlanta may be summarized as follows:

	K
Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food	100
Have cold storage facilities	<u>56</u>
Don't use sea food at all	37
Use sea food, but not frozen processed sea food	19
No cold storage facilities	2424

#### DETAILED FINDINGS

#### Table 1

#### DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?

#### According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

		Type of	Establishment	Sales Volume			
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than \$10,000	\$10.000- 39,999	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100,000 and Over
Total Establishments	(243)	(167)	<b>(</b> 76 <b>)</b>	(114)	(62)	(32)	(35)
	₹c	F.	<u>%</u>	de la	<u>6</u> 2	<u>%</u>	<u> %</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, bought sea food	82.4	78.0	97.9	77.3	84.5	86.7	89.6
Bought frozen processed sea food Bought frozen processed fish Bought frozen processed shellfish Bought portions	<u>72.3</u> 56 <b>.1</b> 46.4 26.7	68.0 51.3 51.0 22.3	88.3 73.4 29.8 42.6	60.3 45.9 25.8 20.1	80.0 59 1 49.1 25.5	83.3 68.3 70.0 43.3	85.1 70.1 80.6 32.8
No, did not buy sea food	17.6	22.0	2.1	22.7	15.5	13.3	10.4

#### DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?

#### According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

		and a first second s	Establishment	Sales Volume			
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- 39,999	\$40,000- 	\$100,000 and <u>Over</u>
Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months	(203)	(129)	<b>(</b> 74)	(91)	(52)	(29)	(31)
	É	<u>%</u>	<u>K</u>	Z	<u>K</u>	Z	3e
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, bought frozen processed sea food	87.9	87.1	90.2	78.0	94.6	96.2	95.0
No, did not buy frozen processed sea food	12.1	12.9	9.8	22.0	5.4	3.8	5.0

#### FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE

According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,00 <b>0-</b> 39,999	\$40,000 and Over		Totai	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- _ <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish	(141)	(54)	(38)	(49)		<u>K</u>	Z	the second secon	<u>I</u>
	ž	Ł	<u>K</u>	Z	Haddock	5.2	>  ,	4.6	5.7
	100.0*	100.0	100.0	100.0	Breaded Fillets Steaks	18.9 .5	3.4 14.6	4.0 7.7 1.5	25.0
Carp Raw	.5	-	-	1.1	Cooked and breaded Breaded fillets Raw	.0 2.4 .c	- - 1.1	-	2.3 3.4 -
$\frac{\text{Catfish}}{\text{Fillets}}$	.5	1.1	-	-	Hal⊥but Fillets	5.7	3.4	6.2	5.7
Cod Breaded	1.4	-	4.6	-	Steaks Raw	1,4 ,5	- 1.1	-	3.4
Fillets Cooked and breaded	5.4 .5	2.2	ч.2 -	5.7 2.3	Lake Perch				
Breaded fillets Raw	9	-		3.4	Raw	. 5	-	1.5	-
Flounder		£ + £			Markerel Filtets		12.4	1.2	12.5
Breaded Fillet: Breaded fillets	<u> </u>	<u>n</u>	- 2 -	1 1 20 5 5.7	Steaks Raw	- -	2.2	4.ť -	_ +
Raw		-	-	2.3					

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

#### Table 3 (Contd.)

## FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE (Continued)

#### According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over		Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- _ <u>39,099</u>	\$40,000 and Over
	2	~ 	<u>A</u>	Z		ħ	<u>₹</u> .	<u>k</u>	70
Mullet Fillets Raw	.0 1.9	1.1 4.5	-	1.1	Sea Bass Fillets	. u	-	3.1	-
Ocean Perch	۲,	1.1	-	-	Smelts Fillets	• F,	-	-	1.1
Breaded Fillets Cooked and breaded	70.8	05 2 1.1	75.4	48.9 -	Sole Filtets	.4	-	-	2,3
Breaded fillets Raw	3 B • 5	3.4	15 -	4.5 1.1	Swordfish Steaks	4.2	-	-	10.2
Red Snapper Fillets Raw	2,8	22	1.5	4.5	$\frac{\operatorname{Trout}}{\operatorname{Fillets}}$ Raw	2 B	-	4.c	34 1.1
Salmon Fillets Steaks	1 + c _2	-	E. 2	5-4 8.0	Whiting Steaks Raw	5 - 17	1.1	-	-

#### QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

	Total	Average Numb All	er of Pounds User		Total	Average Numb	er of Pounds User
	Pounds		User Establishments		Pound.	Establishment.	
Car: Raw	45	(b)	45.Û	Mullet Fillets Raw	525 240	1.2	26 <b>2.5</b> 60.0
Catfish Fillet.	(a)	-	-	Ocean Perch Breaded	12	(a)	12.0
Cod Breaded Fillets Cooked and breaded Breaded fillets	300 2,233 112 120	.7 5.2 (b) (b)	100.0 171.8 55.0 20.0	Fillets Cooked and breaded Breaded fillets Raw	15,990 200 166 10	37.1 .5 (b) (a)	106.6 200.0 20.8 10.0
Raw Flounder	(a)	-	-	Red Snapper Fillets Raw	98 115	(b) (b)	16.3 115.0
Breaded Fillets Breaded fillets Raw	4 1,704 266 13	(a) 4.0 .6 -	4.0 56.8 38.0 6.5	Salmon Fillets Steaks	(a) 349	- .8	31.7
Haddock Breaded Fillets	7,719 13,728	17.9 31.9	701.7 343.2	Sea Bass Fillets	100	(b)	50.0
Steaks Cooked and breaded Breaded fillets	13, 720 8 112 (a)	(a) (b)	8.0 56.0	$\frac{\texttt{Smelts}}{\texttt{Fillets}}$	40	(b)	40.0
Raw		-	-	Sole Fillets	(a)	-	-
Halibut Fillets Steaks Raw	1,560 (a)	3.6	130.0	Swordfish Steaks	149	(b)	16.5
Lake Perch Raw	1.00	(h)	100.0	Trout Fillets Raw	300 45	.7 (b)	50.0 45.0
Mackerel Fillets(c) Steaks Raw	39.078 1.250	40.7 2.9	1503.0 416.7 -	<u>Whiting</u> Steaks Raw	51 360	(b) .8	51.0 60.0

(a) Purchases were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.

(b) Less than half a pound.

(c) Include: Spanish mackerel; one hotel bought a large quantity.

#### SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH FREPREPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

	Total Users (1)		
	<u> </u>		Total Vaers
Total Purchases of Cod	100.0		(1)
Prefer more prepreparation of cod Prefer less prepreparation of cod	-		<u>d</u>
Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer	88.0 12.0	Total Purchases of Mackerel	$\underline{1}^{c^*}, \underline{0}$
		Prefer more prepreparation of mackerel Prefer less prepreparation of mackerel Prefer prepreparation as it is	- - 
Total Purchases of Flounder	100.0	No answer	- 1
Prefer more prepreparation of flounder Prefer less prepreparation of flounder Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer	- 95.0 5.0	Total Furchases of Ocean Perch	100.0
Total Purchases of Haddock	100.0	Prefer more prepreparation of ocean perch Prefer less prepreparation of ocean perch Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer	- 98.1 1.9
Prefer more prepreparation of haddock Prefer less prepreparation of haddock Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer	98.3 1.7		

(1) The percentages shown in the body of the table are computed on the total number of purchases of each species of fish

Many users bought more than one species. Some establishments also bought a species prepared in two different ways. For example, haddock fillets and haddock steaks. This was counted as two purchases of the species.

Pecause purchases of many species were few in number, the species are not included in the table.

#### SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

#### WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION

#### OF FROZEN FROCESSED FISH

	Total
Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish, November, 1958	(141)
	Ż
	100.0
Sat isfied	847
Dissatisfied	1.7
No answer	8.7

#### Table 7

#### PACKAGE SIDES OF PROZEN PROMESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 14-8 AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1)

TITAL		Ź
2 2	Total Purchasers of Mackerel Fillets	<u>10<b>0</b>.0</u>
<u>100,0</u> No.7 15 20.7 -0.7	<ul> <li>pound parkages</li> <li>pound packages</li> <li>10 pound packages</li> <li>26 pound packages</li> <li>50 pound packages and over</li> <li>No answer</li> </ul>	7.6 7.6 50.0 11.6 11.6 11.5
	Total Purchasers of Ocean Perch Fillets	100,0
<u>1400</u>	Packages less than 1 pound 1 pound packages 2 pound packages 3 pound packages 5 pound packages 5 pound packages 10 pound packages 20 pound packages	2.0

30 pound parkages 33 pound packages

it pound packages

per jound

Average tumber of lervings.

N: answer

Total

4.7

4,4

The table shows figures in those species and types of prepreparation which is ar most often in the star

Sometimes figures are shown for package sides but not average number of sorvings per pound. In these uses the data in cerving, per pound is limited

The per entages in the body of the table are to id on the fumbor of estably sments which is as to be the list Thick, preprepared of energies of

Total Furchasers of

Flunder Fillets

Tctal Purchasers of

Haddock Fil ets

3.4

1 pound packages 5 bound packages 10 pound packages

20 pound packages No answer

1 pound packages

No answer

per pound

/ pound packages <sup>t</sup> pound packages 21 pound packages 30 yound packages

50 poind packages and over

Average number of servings

#### SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

#### WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN

#### PROCESSED FISH PACKAGES

# Total Total Total Users of Frozen Processed (141) Ž (141) Ž 100.0 Satisfied 88.5 Dissatisfied 1.2 Don't know .8 No answer 9.5

Table 9

#### PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS

According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- _ <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish	(141)	(54)	(38)	(49)
	<u>%</u>	Æ	Ŀ	É
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Establishments Serving Fried				- 1
None fried 1 - 14%	7.0	11.2	6.2 -	3.4
15 - 34%	3.3	4.5	-	4.5
35 - 64%	20.7	14.6	24.6	23.9
65 - 84%	8.3	6.7	6.2	11.4
Over 84%	47.9	58.5	56.8	30.7
Don't know, no answer, refused	12.8	4.5	6.2	26.1
Average percentage served	70.6	70.6	74.0	67.4
Establishments Serving Broiled				
None broiled	54 9	58 5 12,4	67.7 4 6	42.1
1 - 14% 15 - 34%	7.0 9.5	7.8	4.6	3.4 17.1
15 - 54% 35 - 64%	9.9 11.6	7.8	18 5	10.2
65 - 84%	17	4.5	-	-
Over 84%	2.5	4 5	1.5	11
Don't know, no answer, refused	12.8	4.5	6.2	26.1
Average percentage served	13 û	14 9	12 6	14.3
Establishments Serving Baked				
None baked	65 S	83 1	(= <u>+</u>	43.3
1 - 14%	1.2	3 4	7 7	3.4 12.5
15 - 34% 35 - 64%	53	3.4	1 ( 1 2	12.5
05 - 84%	. 4	-	-	11
0° r 84%	2 ù	5.6	15	1.1
I 't know no answer, refused	12 8	4 5	ъ 2	. 1
A age clentage cerved	14 4	81	H L	1 .
E. lishs to Serving in Other Wave				
one ir other ways	25.2	44 4	87 7	4 (U
1 - 1'-	12	-	4 C	-
15 - 14% 35 - 143	-	-	-	-
31 - ' 0547	-	-	-	-
Over 54%	8	1 1	1.5	-
Don't know, no answer, refused	12 8	4.5	62	20.1
Average percentage served	1.0	1.1	1 7	-
UNCLARE LEICENDARE SELVED	± .	±. ±	-	

#### FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1 + 2 -

#### HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE

	Total		
Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish	(103)		Total
	1/2		topat
	15		<u>%</u>
	100. •		-
		Oysters	
Clams		Breadel	11
Raw; clean	6.º	Cunned	
, ,		Raw: clean, shelled	21.0
Crabs			
Cooked	5-11	Scall po	
Breaded	1.5	Breaded	5.5
Cooked and breaded	1.5	Raw; clean, shelled	-2+L
Cooked and deviled	1.5		
Cooked and shredded	• 5	Shrimp	
Breaded rolls	1.5	Coked	3.
Deviled and stuffed	3.1	Breaded	S4.U
Crab meat - shelled and debellied,		Cucked and breaded	2.5
frozen and canned	· E <sub>2</sub>	Deheaded, raw in shells	1.5
Raw; whole, clean	12.5	Broken pieces	۲۰.
		Raw; clean, deheaded, shelled	
Lobster		and deveined	
Cooked	R. De		
Breaded	• C		
Cooked and shredded tail:	• <sup>1</sup>		
Cleaned and deheaded tails	4.		
Raw; whole, clean	11.		

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

#### QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

			ber of Pounds
	Total Pounds	All Establishme <u>nts</u>	User Establishments
<u>Clams</u> Raw; clean	1,631	3.8	135.9
Crabs	1,080	2.5	180.0
Cooked Breaded	(a)	<i>∠.)</i> -	-
Cooked and breaded	600	1.4	200.0
Cooked and deviled	(a)	(b)	12.0
Cooked and shredded Breaded rolls	12 (a)	(0)	-
Deviled and stuffed	168	(b)	24.0
Crab meat - shelled and debellied,	0,109	5.6	220.8
frozen and canned Raw: whole, clean	2,428 2,318	⊃•¤ 5.4	92.7
haw, wholey clean			
Lobster	225	.5	37.5
Cooked Breaded	(a)	• ) -	-
Cooked and shredded tails	12	(b)	12.0
Raw; whole, clean	14,082	32.7	640.1
Oysters			
Breaded	1,184	2.7	53.8
Canned	(a) 3,028	7.0	- 72.1
Raw; clean, shelled	5,020	1.0	14.1
Scallops			280.0
Breaded Raw: clean, shelled	3,080 4,303	7.1 10.0	97.8
raw; clean, shelled	1,000	<u> </u>	
Shrimp	150	()	25.0
Cooked Breaded	150 8,124	(b) 18.8	25.0 75.2
Cooked and breaded	667	1.5	133.3
Deheaded, raw in shells	310	• 7	102.3 20.0
Broken pieces Raw: clean, deheaded, shelled	120	• 3	_v.v
and deveined	13,011	30.2	194.2

(a) Purchases were not reported in quantities imposing to compare meaning and figure.

(b) Less than half a pound.

#### SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

#### WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION OF

#### FROZEN PROCESSED SHFLLFISH

#### Total 181 Users (1) 96 Total Purchases of Crabs 100.0 100.0 Total Purchases of Scallops Prefer more prepreparation of crabs -Prefer more prepreparation of scallops Prefer less prepreparation of crabs Prefer less prepreparation of scallops 100.0 Prefer prepreparation as it is Prefer prepreparation as it is Total Purchases of Lobster 100.0 177 O Total Purchases of Shrimp Prefer more prepreparation of lobster -Prefer more prepreparation of shrimp -Prefer less prepreparation of lobster Prefer less prepreparation of shrimp \_ Prefer prepreparation as it is 100.0 Prefer prepreparation as it is 99.5 100.0 Total Purchases of Oysters Prefer more prepreparation of oysters -Prefer less prepreparation of oysters -93.8 Prefer prepreparation as it is 6.2 No answer

Table 12

SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

#### To'al Total Users of Frozen Frocessed Shellfish, November, 1950 (103)100.0 95.0 Satisfied 1.5 Dissatisfied 3.5 No answer

5

¢

(1) The percentages shown in the body of the table are computed on the total number of purchases of each species of shellfish

Many establishments 'ought more than one species. Some establishment: also bought a species prepared in two different ways. For example, shr.mp breased and shrimp cooked This was counted as two surchases of the species.

Because purchases of come species--clams, abalone, and others-were few in number, the source are not included in the table

PACKAGE SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1)

	Total		Total
	Ľ		<u>%</u>
Total Purchasers of Crabs - Row	100.0	Total Purchasers of	100.0
	20.0	<u>Oysters - Raw</u>	100.0
l pound packages	12.0	Peakages loss then I nound	14.2
2 pound packages		Packages less than 1 pound	
3 pound packages	15.0	1 pound packages	7.2
5 pound packages	16 0	3 pound packages	7.2
12 pound packages	4.0	4 pound packages	50.0
No answer	32.0	5 pound packages	7.2
		No answer	14 2
Total Purchasers of	1-0-0	Total Purchasers of	
Lobster - Raw	100.0		100.0
		Oysters - Breaded	100.0
l pound packages	4.5		. <b>1</b>
5 pound packages	40 9	1 pound packages	9.1
8 pound packages	4 5	3 pound packages	27 3
17 pound packages	13 7	h pound packages	13.6
50 pound packages and over	31.9	5 Pound Packages	27.3
No answer	4.5	10 pound packages	13 0
		No answer	9.1

 The table snows figures for those species and types of prepresention which occur most often in the cit.

Sometimes figures are snown for package where out of average number of servings for pound. In these packathe data on servings per pound is limited

The period ages in the mode of the table are to for the number of establishments which bought one  $\eta$  for of shellfish prepared on one manual.

(Contd.)

## FACKAGE SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1) (Continued)

	Total	
	<u>%</u>	
	Ĕ	
Total Purchasers of		
Scallops - Raw	100.0	
	11.4	
pound packages	6.8	
pound packages	77.2	
pound packages lo answer	4.6	Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw
o allswei		
		2 pound packages
		3 pound packages
Total Purchasers of		5 pound packages
Shrimp - Breaded	100.0	6 pound packages
		18 pound packages
pound packages	3.7	30 p <b>o</b> und packages
pound packages	5.6	50 pound packages and over
pound packages	25.0	No answer
pound packages	16.6	
pound packages	37.9	Average number of servings
	56	per pound
	/ 0	
pound packages	- 9	
5 pound packages 8 pound packages 10 pound packages	-	

per pound

٠

2.5

(1) The table shows figures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur most often in the city

Sometimes figures are shown for package sizes but not average number of servings per pound. In these cases the data on servings per pound is limited.

The manages in the body of the table are based on the manager of establishments which bought one species of bullflub, preprepared to one manner

#### SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

#### WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN

#### PROCESSED SHELLFISH PACKAGES

	Total
Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish	<b>(</b> 103 <b>)</b>
	<u> </u>
	100.0
Satisfied	48.5
Dissatisfied	lŬ
No answer	• 5

#### PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS

Table 16

Total Users of Froze: Processed Shellfish	<u>Total</u> (103) <u>\$</u> 100.0	Total Upers of Frozer. Processed Shellfish	<u>Total</u> (103) <u>1</u> 100.0
Establishments Serving Fried None Tried 1 - 14% 15 - 34% 35 - 54% 65 - 84% Over 24% Don't know, nc answer, refused	1.5 1.5 2.5 17.0 22.0 29.0 16.5	Establishments Serving Baked None baked 1 - 145 15 - 345 35 - 645 65 - 545 Over 545 Over 545 Dor't Know, no answer, refused	66.( 5 ( 10.0 2.0 
Average percentage served	73.5	Average percentage served	5 I

ablishments Serving Broiled None broiled	64.5	None in other ways	59.0
1 - 14%	3.5	1 - 14%	2.0
15 - 34 <b>%</b>	16.0	15 - 34%	15.5
35 - 64 <b>%</b>	4.5	35 - 64%	5.0
65 - 84 <b>%</b>	1.0	65 - 84%	-
Over 84%	-	Over 84%	2.0
Don't know, no answer, refused	16.5	Don't know, no answer, refused	16.9
Average percentage served	6.8	Average percentage served	4.0

Note: Percentages, other than average percentages, are based on total establishments interviewed. Average percentages are computed by assigning the mases in any one of the six intervals to the midpoint of the interval, and taking an average of all the cases.

#### TYPES OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

According to Type of Establishment

#### Table 18

#### QUANTITY OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

Total Users of Portions	<u>Total</u> (65)	Public Eating <u>Places</u> (33)	Institutions (32)
	Ľ	Z	楚
	100.0*	100.0	100.0
Cooked - breaded	27.8	20.2	42.5
Cooked - plain	5.2	5+3	5.0
Uncooked - breaded	41.7	45.6	35.0
Uncooked - plain	46.7	47.0	30.0

		Average Number of Pounds		
	Total Pounds	All Establishments	User Establishments	
Cooked - breaded	2,518	5.8	78.7	
Cooked - plain	186	(b)	31.0	
Uncooked - breaded	13,661	31.7	284.6	
Uncooked - plain	4.051	Ģ. 4	86 2	

(b) Less than half a pound

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

#### AMOUNT OF PORTIONS BOUGHT BY ESTABLISHMENTS,

#### AS COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR

According to Type of Establishment

Table 20

#### SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH

#### QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS

Total

	1 Purchases of Types of Ortions, November, 1958	<b>(</b> 75 <b>)</b>
		<u>%</u>
		100.0
Satisfied		99.2
Dissatisfi	ed	~
No answer		. 8
Note:	Figures are based on total purchases of types of por-	

tions. Some establishments bought more than one type.

	Total	Eating Places	Institutions	
Total Users of Portions	(65)	(33)	(32)	
	<u> %</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Use more now	13.0	12.0	15.0	
Use about the same	74.8	74.6	75.0	
Use less now	3.5	2.7	5.0	
Don't know	8.7	10.7	5.0	

Public

#### IS THE QUALITY OF PORTIONS BETTER THAN THAT OF OTHER

#### FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?

	Total
Total Users of Portions	(65)
	Ľ
	100.0
Say portions better Fresher Uniform controlled serving - always same amount Ease of preparation - saves time, labor Quality	22.6 9.6 2.6 1.7
Just like them better – brand I buy is better All others Don't know – no answer	.9 4.3 4.3
Portions poorer Poor quality - inferior quality, can't tell what is in them All others	<u>5.2</u> 2.6 2.6
About the same	62.6
Don't know	8.7
No answer	.9

#### Table 22

#### ADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

	Total
Total Users of Portions, November, 1958	<b>(</b> 65)
	É
	100.0*
Size of portions - uniform, controlled serving, the right size service	35.6
Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor, already prepared	33.9
Economical - no waste	25.2
${f F}$ ast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare	20.0
Can control food cost better - know profit	15.6
No bones	9.5
Taste better	.8
Don't know, no answer	.8

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

#### DO ESTABLISHMENTS THINK CUSTOMERS PREFER PORTIONS TO OTHER

#### FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?

	Total		
Total Users of Portions	(65)		Total
	K	Total Users of Portions	(65)
	<u>100.0</u> *		Z
Not economical - more expensive to buy	15.7		100.0
Portions wrong size - too small	5.2	Think customers like portions better Uniform controlled servings - always the	27.8*
Quality not as good - not always sure what's in them	2.6	same amount Attractive - eye appealing Customers order - seem to like them	13.0 7.8 4.3
Not enough demand - customers do not order	1.7	Faster quicker to serve - no waiting No bones - safer for children	2.6 2.6
No disadvantages	71.3	Economical Don't know - no answer	1.7 1.7
Don't know, no answer	0.1	Think customers like portions less	2.6
		Think customers like portions about the same	49,6
		Don't know	1ó.5
		No answer	35

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 23

DISADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

#### 23

#### AVERAGE WEIGHT OF PORTIONS AND AVERAGE NUMBER

#### OF SERVINGS PER PACKAGE

Total users of purtions, November. 1958	ΰ <u>5</u>
Average weight of package of portions, in pounds	7 <b>.</b> ŕ
Average number of servings per package	32.4
Average weight of individual servings, in ounces	3.7
Average weight of individua, portions, in ounces	5.1

Note: Average weight of portions does not equal average weight of individual servings since some operators obtained more than one serving from a portion, while other operators used more than one portion for a serving.

#### Table 26

#### SATISFACTION WITH THE SIZE OF

#### PORTIONS IN A PACKAGE

#### Total

Total Users of Portions	(65)
	É
	100.0
Satisfied	97.4
Dissatisfied	1.7
Don't know, no answer	0

#### PERCENTAGE OF POPTIONS SERVED FRIEN, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS

According to Type of Establishment

	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions		Total	Public Eating Place.	festitutions
Total Users of Portions	(65)	(33)	(32)	Total Users of Fortions	(65)	(33)	(32)
	羗	50	ž		<u>K</u>	40 	<u>R</u>
	100.0	100.0	100		100.0	<u>100.5</u>	100.1
Establishments Serving Fried				Establishments Serving Baned			
None fried	13.9	1.3	31.5	None baked	73.9	85.4	52.5
1 – 14% 15 – 34%	- 14.8	-	-	1 - 1'4%	·9	-	2 5
17 - 3472 35 - 6496	7.0	14.7 5.3	15.0 10.0	15 - 34%	6.1	5.3	7.5
65 - 84 <b>%</b>	10.4	12.0	7.5	35 - 64% 65 - 84%	4.3 6.1	5.3	2 5
Over 84%	53.9	66.7	30.0	07 - 04% Over 84%	8.7	4.0	10.0
orei orp		00.1	20.0	0,61,04%	0.7	-	25.U
Average percentage served	64.7	76.8	42.0	Average percentage served	16.3	6. <u>9</u>	≅.8
Establishments Serving Broiled				Establishments Serving in			
None breiled	i ≟ • 3	77.3	62.5	Ôther Ways			
1 - 14%	+.3	27	7.5	None in other ways	100.0	100.0	100.0
15 - 34%	7.8	6.7	10.0	1 - 14%	-	-	-
35 - 64%	9 E	9.3	10.0	15 - 34%	-	-	-
65 - 84%	2.0	4 Ŭ	-	45 <b>-</b> 64%	-	-	-
Over 84%	3 - 5	-	10.0	65 - 84%	-	-	-
A		2 L		Over 84%	-	-	-
Average percentage served	12 1	<u>9</u> .4	17.2	Average percentage served	-		

#### DO ESTABLISHMENTS COOK PORTIONS WHILE STILL FROZEN?

According to Type of Establishment

	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions
Total Users of Portions	(65)	(33)	(32)
	Ź	ž	Ľ
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, cook while frozen	70.4	73.4	65.0
No, do not cook while frozen	26.1	21.3	35.0
No answer	3.5	5.3	-

Table 29

#### COST OF USING PORTIONS, AS COMPARED TO OTHER FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

#### AND REASONS WHY PORTIONS ARE THOUGHT MORE CR LESS EXPENSIVE

		Total
Total Us	ers of Portions	(65)
		<u> <del>1</del></u>
		100.0
Say portions more expensive Cost is more for amount of serving Price includes processing and packaging -	5 <b>5</b> 657679 -	<u>15.5</u> 6.1
ration would tend to raise cost	FileFiebæ=	4.3
Don't know - no answer		r.1
<u>Fortions less expensive</u> Less or no waste Labor saving - requires no preparation Uniform controlled servings Time saving Goes further - more servings from package Can control food costs better - know your Don't know - no answer	profit	1.2* 1.1 6.1 5.2 3.5 2.6 1.3
About the same		35.0
Don't know		12.ž
No answer		.9

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question,

## WHEN ORDERING FORTIONS FROM SUPPLIERS, DO ESTABLISHMENTS

#### SPECIFY THE KIND OF FISH?

#### According to Type of Establishment

#### Table 31

## WOULD THE ESTABLISHMENTS LIKE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION

#### CONTROLLED SEA FOOD ITEMS NOT NOW AVAILABLE?

According to Type of Establishment

	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	(112)	(68)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, would like other items	1.9	1.3	3.6
No, would not like other items	88.8	88.2	90.4
Don't know	8.3	9.6	4.8
No answer	1.0	.9	1.2

	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions
Total Users of Portions	<b>(</b> 65)	(33)	(32)
	<u>K</u>	<u>%</u>	Ĺ
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Specify kind of fish	95.7	94-7	97.5
Do not specify kind of fish	4.3	5+3	2.5

Total Est: listments Using Frigen Proposition Set Food, but Not Forrights	<u>Total</u> (115) <u>#</u> 100 0	WAS PRICE A REASON FSTABLISHMENT. DID NOT BUY FORLIONCS	- -
Too expensive - inexper to use frech f observe to tropper ourselves Berke other type: - perch. shrimp, -blitt, etc., other types more porular Sell serve little or no fish - no israwi, cill for if Prefer to prejare own - r for treas no own for not like way it must be nooked preter own method- Size of portions - trefer to cur own portions warf larger portions, get more with other kings Quality not a good - toeon's met our quality stimised. can't tell what is is Use troop fuch - prefer treas tubi	29.4 25.9 17.8 11.7 10.7 10.7 5.6 5.6	Fotal Non-Hen Who Pis Not Volunteer Price a g Reano	<u>Totai</u> . 4 <u>4</u> 1 <u>01 . 1</u>
Di.like flavor - freur fish has more flavor, no faste to portion controlled sea foods bon't 1 ke them so wouldn't perceited Juit opened the methaurant - don't know what we will handle not attractive - not ever speaking No purticular nearor - just his?" Wartel to change menu - try cometring different Company makes the rules - coller against it Didn't know it was include	5.0 2.5 1.5 1.6 1.6 5 5	Nell price was a reason No. price was not a reason No access	134 657
All others Don't know, no answer	1.5 3.6		

28

REASONS ESTABLISHMENTS DID NOT BUY PORTIONS DURING NOVEMBER, 1-50

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## Table 32

## TYPES OF SUPPLIER PROVIDING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD TO ESTABLISHMENTS

According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- _ <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	<b>(</b> 73 <b>)</b>	(50)	(57)
	K	de Le	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	100.0*	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sea food processors	2.9	-	-	8.4
Sea food wholesalers	72.1	72.6	75.0	69.2
Frozen food distributors	19.9	17.1	11.4	29.9
All other, grocery stores, supermarkets	6.4	10.3	6.8	1.9
No answer	2.2	-	6.8	• <u>9</u>

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

# DISTANCE OF ESTABLISHMENT FROM MAIN SUPPLIER OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

According to Location

	Total	Out of Central Business District	In Central Business District
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	(144)	(36)
	<u>¢</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>K</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 10 miles	77.6	75.8	83.8
10 - 50 miles	14.4	17.6	3.0
51 - 100 miles	• 3	.4	-
More than 100 miles	1.9	-	8.8
Don't know	3.9	4.9	-
No answer	1.9	1.3	4.4

#### FREQUENCY OF DELIVERIES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

			<b>E</b> stablishment		Sales Volume	
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	<b>(</b> 180)	(112)	<b>(</b> 68)	<b>(</b> 73)	<b>(</b> 50)	<b>(</b> 57)
	<u>%</u>	<u>K</u>	Ĕ	<u>%</u>	<u>K</u>	Ŀ
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Every day	8.0	9.2	4.8	1.7	12.5	11.2
2 - 4 times per week	26.6	33.6	7.2	14 6	26.1	40,2
Once a week	45.8	45.0	48.2	50.4	47.7	39.3
2 - 3 times per month	9.9	7.4	16.9	17.1	5.7	5.5
Once a month	4.5	1.3	13.3	7.7	2.3	2.8
Less than once a month	3.9	2.6	7.2	5.1	5.7	. 9
Don't know, no answer	1.3	.9	2.4	3.4		-

# CAN SUPPLIERS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IMPROVE SERVICES TO ESTABLISHMENTS:

According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	(73)	(50)	(57)
	<u>K</u>	<u>K</u>	%	Ľ
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, can improve services	3.5	2.6	5.7	2,8
No, cannot improve services	94-6	95+7	94-3	93+5
Don't know	1.6	1.7	-	2.8
No answer	. 3	-	-	9

# AMOUNT SPENT FOR FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD DURING PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS

According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than <b>\$</b> 10,000	\$10,000 _ <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	(73)	(50)	(57)
	Z	<u>%</u>	Z	<u>%</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spent under \$250 \$250 - 499 \$500 - 999 \$1,000 - 2,499	33.7 20.2 18.2 10.4	56.1 21.2 12.1 7.6	14.6 27.1 35.4 8.3	20.0 10.0 7.5 17.5
\$2,500 - 4,999 \$5,000 - 9,999 \$10,000 - 14,999 \$15,000 - 29,999	7.2 7.2 1.9 .6	3.0 - -	14.6	22.5 10.0 7.5 2.5
\$30,000 - 49,999 \$50,000 - 99,999 \$100,000 and over	- - . 6	- - -	-	2.5

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000 and Over
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	(73)	(50)	(57)
	É	<u> 4</u>	¢	É
	<u>100.0</u> *	100.0	100.0	100.0
Say sea food more profitable than other high protein foods	17.3	17.1	22.7	13.1
Say beef more profitable than sea food	8.3	5.1	9.1	11.2
Say all foods the same in profitability	1.0	-	-	2.8
Say pork more profitable than sea food	. 6	1.7	-	-
Say miscellaneous other foods more profitable than sea food	• 3	.9	-	-
Nonprofit establishments	23.4	29.9	21.6	17.8
Don't know	36.6	31.6	31.8	45.8
No answer	12.5	13.7	14.8	9.3

# PROFITABILITY TO ESTABLISHMENTS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD AND OTHER HIGH PROTEIN FOODS

Table 38

According to Sales Volume

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS KNOW THEY CAN BUY GOVERNMENT

## INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishment

	<u>Total</u>	Public Eating Places	Institutions
Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food	(180)	(112)	(68)
	<u>K</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, know they can	84.6	83.0	89.2
No, do not know they can	15.4	17.0	10.8

# DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR

# GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishment

Total Establishments Knowing Government Inspected or	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions
Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available	(153)	(92)	(61)
	Z	Z	<u>K</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes, do buy	97-3	98.4	94.6
No, do not buy	-	-	-
No answer	2.7	1.6	5.4

	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions
Total Purchasers of Government Inspected or Graded Sea Food	(150)	(91)	(59)
	Ľ	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	100.0*	100.0	100.0
Government inspected foods are safe - pure, fresh, clean, no germs or disease	35.8	33.7	41.4
<pre>Best quality - use better products, more uniform quality Only type available - it's all inspected, that's what supplier carries Public demands it</pre>	33-5	31.0	40.0
	21.8 2.7	25.7 3.7	11.4
Easy to handle - easy to serve, ready to cook, portion controlled More economical Company demands that it's bought Prefer Government inspected - wouldn't buy any other	2.3 1.6 .8	1.6 1.6 -	4.3 1.4 2.9 1.4
All others	1.2	1.1	1.4
Don't know, no answer	10.9	11.8	8.6

## REASONS ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

#### According to Type of Establishment

Table 41

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

#### Table 42

# HAS GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AFFECTED THE AMOUNT OF FROZEN IF GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD BOUGHT BY THE ESTABLISHMENT: PROCESSED SEA FOOD WERE AVAILABLE WOULD According to Type of Establishment THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY MORE OR LESS:

Total Users of Government Inspected Frozen Processed Sea Food	<u>Total</u> (150)	Public Eating <u>Places</u> ('4)	<u>Institutions</u> (59)	Total Establishments Not Know- ing Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available	<u>Total</u> (27)
	<u>16</u>	Ł	<u>K</u>		<u>%</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0
Buy more	5.8	4 8	86	Say they would buy more	12.5
	79.8	78.1	84.3	Say they would buy less	-
Buy about the same	19.0			About the same	33•3
Buy less	-	-	-		
Don't know	14.0	17.1	5.7	Don't know	45.9
DOIL G. KHOW	1			No. opputer	8.3
No answer	4 <sup>1</sup> 4	-	14	No answer	0.0

PREVIOUS USE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD BY NONUSERS AND

#### REASONS FOR STOPPING USE OR FOR NEVER USING

	Total
Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food	<b>(</b> €3)
	<u>K</u>
	100.0
Have served frozen processed sea food before	4 2
No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods Lacked flavor - own prepared fish has better flavor	3-4 8
Have not served frozen processed sea food before	<u>93_3</u> *
Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not in that business No storage facilities - no freezer Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, fresh	64.7 16.0
fish available all year Unable to handle preparation - no equipment, not enough room, no time, would need extra help Like taste, freshness of fresh fish - don't trust	84 67
frozen food, fresh fish tastes better, some frozen is kept too long Duk T know, no answer	5 O 1 -
'on t know	25

\*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## DU ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STURAGE FACILITIES PUB KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOIT:

			Establishment		Sales	Volume	
	lots	Public Eating Flaces	Institutions	Less Than \$10,10	\$10,000 - 30,040	\$40.000- 04.000	\$17 and 
Total E.tablishments	(2+3)	(167)	(76)	,114:	(62)	(32)	(25
	<sup>o</sup> r	ц <u>і</u>	<u>F</u>	Gr.	GR	<del>ž</del>	51
	100.0	100.1	100.6	100.0	100.1	100.0	<u>100.00</u>
Yes, have cold storage fabilities	Der B	82.3	87.2	78.4	81.8	93.3	91.C
No, do not have cold storage facilities	16.2	17,2	1ā.8	21.6	18.2	ő.†	e.0
No answer	.5	.1	-	-	-	-	3.0
Average capacity, in cution feer	5 <u>2</u> .6	25.3	100.9	29.2	21.0	43.8	(a)

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

(a' Too few cases to compute an average.

#### DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROPESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Nonusers of Sea Food and Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food

	<u>Total</u>	Nonusers of Sea Food	Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food
Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food	<b>(</b> 63)		
	Ze	<u>K</u>	<u>%</u>
	100.0	63.9	<u>36.1</u>
Yes, have cold storage facilities	55.5	37.0	18.5
No, do not have cold storage facilities	42.8	26.9	15.9
No answer	1.7	-	1.7

## DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

(Tables a through i contain classification data regarding operations of the establishments)

## Table a

# TOTAL RECTIPT: FROM MEALS SERVED DURING 1057 OF LAST FIDDAL YEAR

According to Type of Establishmer

	Tot cu	Puril. Esting Place-	Instautio.r
Total Establishments	2- <u>-</u>	(157	/
	<u></u>	ين 	4
Total Receipts	100.00	100.0	100.0
Less than \$10,000	45	43.2	52.2
\$10,000 - 39,999	25.5	26.1	23.4
\$40,000 - 99.995	13.9	13.9	13.8
\$1.4,000 and over	15 5	16.9	10.6

## Table b

## AMOUNT ESTABLISHMENTS SPENT FOR FOOD DURING PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS

			Establishment		Sales	Volume	
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than \$10,000	<b>\$1</b> 0,000- 39,999	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100,000 and Over
Total Establishments	(243)	(167)	(76)	(114)	(62)	(32)	(35)
	É	<u>K</u>	Ľ	Z	<u>Je</u>	Ľ	Z
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spent under \$1,000 \$1,000 - 2,499 \$2,500 - 4,999 \$5,000 - 9,999 \$10,000 - 14,999	7.2 17.0 10.4 18.6 14.2	10.0 22.8 8.5 14.4 12.1	2.0 15.4 28.6 19.2	13.7 30.4 19.0 24.3 5.3	4.3 2.2 19.6 41.4	9.4 4.9	- - 4.8
\$15,000 - 29,999 \$30,000 - 49,999 \$50,000 - 99,999 \$100,000 - 249,999 \$250,000 and over	11.4 10.4 3.2 4.4 3.2	11.3 10.8 2.3 3.9 3.9	11.6 9.6 5.8 5.8 2.0	7.3 - - -	23.9 8.6 - -	14.3 57.1 14.3	14.4 14.4 38.0 28.4

## Table c

## PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OPERATING COST SPENT FOR FOOD IN PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS

		Type of	Type of Establishment Sa			les Volume		
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than <b>\$10,000</b>	\$10,000- 39,999	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100,000 and Over	
Total Establishments	(243)	(167)	<b>(</b> 76 <b>)</b>	(114)	(62)	(32)	(35)	
	É	Z	<u>%</u>	Z	<u>K</u>	<u>¢</u>	<u>%</u>	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Spent under 5% for food 5 - 14% 15 - 24% 25 - 34%	7.1 5.7 25.0	- 7.3 4.6 23.9	6.5 9.7 29.0	- 3.8 9.0 28.2	21.2 24.3	- 7.7 7.7	25.0	
35 - 44% 45 - 54% 55 - 64% 65 - 74%	24.3 14.3 3.7	28.5 16.5 -	9.7 6.5 16.1	16.7 15.4 6.4	27.3 12.1	7.7 30.7	68.8 - - -	
75 - 84% 85 - 94% 95 - 100%	17.1 2.1 .7	17.4 1.8	16.1 3.2 3.2	17.9 1.3 1.3	12.1 3.0	46.2 - -	6.2	

## Table d

## AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

		Type of Establishment			Sales Volume			
	Total	Public Eating Places	[nstitutions	Less Than \$10.000	\$10,000- 39,999	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100 D. N NG1 	
Total Establishments	243	167	<u>76</u>	114	62	32	<u>5</u>	
Average Number of Main Meals Served								
Midday, weekdays	176	128	297	89	108	213	્રતેલ	
Sea food meals	26	53	Ъ.С.	9	ē ī	30	345 31	
Midday, Saturdays and Sundays	100	107	81	21	94	94	396	
Sea food meals	13	17	**	1	7	13	7:-	
Evening, weekdays	87	92	71	14	81	94	34 E	
Sea food meals	14	15	Q	5	12	23	52	
Evening, Saturdays and Sundays	81	86	64	13	66	73	354	
Sea food meals	11	14	1	ì	8	15	52	

\*\* Less than one haif meal.

## Table e

## AVERAGE PRICE PER MEAL SERVED

				Sales Volume			
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than \$10,000	<b>\$10,000-</b> <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100,000 and Over
Total Establishments	(243)	(167)	(76)	(114)	<b>(</b> 62)	(32)	(35)
	<u>%</u>	<u> </u>	<u>1</u> /2	<u>%</u>	<u>q6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	100.0	100.0	100 0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$.25 \$.2549 \$.5074 \$.7599	.5 13.2 20.9 23.6	.6 5.6 24.9 28.7	40, 14 6, 14 5, 3	1.0 20.1 34.7 21.1	15.5 14.5 31.9	8.3 23.3	1.5 3.0 17.9
\$1.00 - 1.49 \$1.50 - 1.99 \$2.00 - 2.49 \$2.50 - 2.99	15.3 3.2 1.9 2.1	19.3 4.2 2.4 2.7	1.1	2.6 .5 .5 1.0	20.0 3.6 -	33.4 1.7 5.0 3.3	28.4 11.9 6.0 7.5
\$3.00 - 3.99 \$4.00 - 4.99 \$5.00 and over	- 5 - -	. ర - -	- -	- - -	1.8 - -	-	-
No answer	11.8	11.0	14.9	11.3	9.1	16.7	13.4
Nonprofit establishment	7.0	-	31.9	7.2	3.6	8.3	10.4

#### Table f

## NUMBER OF REGULAR EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PREPARING AND SERVING FOOD

#### According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000- _99,999	\$100,000 and Over
Total establishments	243	114	02	32	35
Average number per establishment	9	3	6	9	33

## Table g

•.

#### SEATING CAPACITY OF ESTABLISHMENTS

		Type of Establishment			Sales Volume			
	Total	Public Eating	itutions	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- 39,999	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100,000 and Over	
Total establishments	243	167	76	114	62	32	35	
Average seating capacity, in seats	97	83	155	51	90	115	230	

# Table h

#### NUMBER OF DAYS OF THE WEEK ON WHICH ESTABLISHMENTS SERVE MEALS

	Type of Establishment		Sales Volume				
	Total	Public Eating Places	Institutions	Less Than \$10,000	<b>\$</b> 10,000- <u>3</u> 9,999	\$40,000- 99,999	\$100,000 and Over
Total Establishments	(243)	(167)	(76)	(114)	(62)	(32)	(35)
	Ľ	Ľ	Z	Ľ	<u>¢</u>	É	Ŀ
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Serve on 7 days	37.6	37.6	37.2	32.0	33.6	43.3	55.2
Serve on 6 days	39.9	49.0	7.5	43.8	41.8	31.7	32.8
Serve on 5 days	21.6	12.2	55.3	24.2	24.6	21.7	9.0
Serve on less than 5 days	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No answer	• 9	1.2	-	-	-	3.3	3.0

## Table i

## PERCENTAGE OF ESTABLISHMENTS SERVING SPECIALIZED TYPES OF FOOD

According to Sales Volume

	Total	Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000- <u>39,999</u>	\$40,000- <u>99,999</u>	\$100,000 and 
Total Establishments	(243)	(114)	(62)	(32)	(35)
	ž	de la companya de la comp	<u>K</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Je</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Establishments with no specialty	83.2	91.3	81.0	76.7	70.1
Establishments with specialty	16.8	8.7	19.0	23.3	29.9
Steak or chophouse Chicken specialty Barbecue Sea food	5.8 2.8 2.6 1.6	3.1 3.6 -	4.5 4.5 5.5	8.3 - 8.3 3.3	13.4 
Kosher French food Chinese food Italian food	•9 •7 •5	1.5 - -	1.8	1.7 - 1.7	4.5 - 1.5
All others	1.4	.5	1.8	-	4.5



