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## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. Use of Frozen Procpized 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 purchasea $f$ :ata food in the frozen processed form.

Fifty-six per cent of ail the establishments said they had bought frozer procossed fish in November, 1058: 46 per cent syid they had bought fropon processed shellfish; and $\langle\rightarrow$ ftr sent said they han bought pirtion.

Among institutigns (such as schools and hospital!, the incidence of ase of frozen procensed see foud was greater than among public eating places.

Of the ten cities in the survey, Atlanta rank-d second, in thrms of the per,entage of all patatlishmants buying frozen processed sea food.
B. Frozen Proressed Fish - Purchases, Attitudes. and Practices

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

More than two thirds of the users of frozen
processed fish bought ocean perch fillets dur-
ing November, 1958. This was the most pupular
of the frozen pr cessed fish items served in
this area.
Haddock fillets were also bought in large quar-
tities by many establishments in At lanta.

Ortan perch fillets wre bought, widt:ly and in substantial quantities in the Southern and Middle Western cities included in the survey, while haddock fillets were popular purcnases in Omaha, Springfield and Cleveland.
$\therefore$ Atritudes Poward Frepreparition and Quality and Conditiun of Fisn (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 citres included in the survey.
3. Parkaging 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 iter.
4. Methods of Preparing and Strving Fish (Tahle ?)

Frying was the most popular mithod 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.



More than hat1 - 1 the frozen wreessed snellfish wetrs In A+ unt bought breaded shrimp in llovember, $14^{*}$. A third of the fistablishments bought riw ohrimp.

Rew lobster, hownor, led in At lanta in terms of toticl quant ity gurchased.

Breaded shrimp and raw shrimp were bought widelv and in larte quantities in all of the cities included in the study.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation: Toward

Quality and Coudition of Shelusish
Tables 12,12 )
All but a few mur hasers were satizfied with the present prepreparation of shellfish. and with the quality and condition of the sh:llfish which they bought.

The same held gerberally true for the othor cities in the surviy.
3. Packaging of Shellfish (Tables 14, 15)

As with ifsh, shtilifeh was most irequently bought in 5 potint nacites in Atlanta.

* Methods of Freparing and Serving Shellfish (Table Ir)

Fryine was the most FuFmidr way of preparing shell-
 three fuarters of ite shelltioslefried.


1. Purnases: Type of Prepreparation

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

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

In Atlanta, portions which were uncookedbreaded and uncooked-plain were the leading itoms in terms of the percentage of estatlishments 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 imount 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 , $22,22,24)$

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

About a quarter =i the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was ketter than that of other frozen processed fish.

More than 00 per cent rated the quality as about the same, while 5 per cent considered the quality poorer.

Major advantages cited for portions included

## $\%$ of Jsers

 Citing| Size of portions, uriform portions | 36 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Convenience, ease cf preparation | 34 |
| Eronomy, no waste | 25 |
| Fast, timesaving | 20 |
| Can control food costs better - |  |
| know profit | 16 |

About 30 per cent of the users cited some dis advantage to asing protions. The most frequently mentiuned disadvantage was that portions are not, economical.

Users of portions generally thought their rus-
tomers 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 average weight of a package of portions for the city was 7.0 pounds.

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

Almost all establishmer $s$, in Atlanta and the oth+r nine cities, said they were sat.isfied 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 At, lanta, the average establishment served 12 per cent. of its portions broiled and 16 per cent bared.

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.
o. Miscellaneous Findings About Portions
(Tables 30, 31)

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

Fewer than 2 per cent. of the users suggested
any neng furtion items, not now availatele, which they would like to hrve.

1. Nonusprs of Portions (Table 32)

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

Price qlso 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 $23,34,3$ )
Estinblishments 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 tne 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 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 weet: in about a quarter of the establishments.

Only a small fraction if the purchasers said they could think of ways in which the suppliers could improve their services.
F. Expens itures for Erozen Pr zessed Sea Food;
Its Pr 'itability (Tables, 7, 38)

A third of the establishments reporting in Atlanta said that they spent less than $\$ 250$ for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twel ve 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 fools.
G. Government Inspection of Erozen Processed Sea
Food - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes
(Tables 31, 40, 41, 42)

All but 15 per cent of the establishments in Atlanta were aware that they could buy frozen processed ses 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, tor cent said the inspection had caused them to buy more.
H. Nonusers of Frozer Processed Sea Food: Cold Storage Facilities (Tables 43, 44, 45)

Most nonusers in Atlanta said they had never hought 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 nthr cities, though, this reason was not often given.

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

Total Nonusers of Frozen
Processed Sea Food

## Have cold storage facilities

Don't use sea food at all
Use sea food, but not frozen processed sea food

## DETAILED FINDINGS

Table 1

DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY SEA FOOD IV THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS？
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Flaces | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ \mathrm{ll} .000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.000- \\ 39.999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | （243） | （167） | （76） | （114） | （62） | （32） | （35） |
|  | \％ | 呂 | 中 | \＄ | 是 | t | ¢ |
|  | 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 | 72． 3 | 68.0 | 88.3 | 60.3 | 80.0 | 83.3 | 85.1 |
| Bought frozen processed fish | 56.1 | 51.3 | 73.4 | 45.9 | 591 | 68.3 | 70.1 |
| Bought frozen processed shellfish | 46.4 | 51.0 | 29.8 | 25.8 | 49.1 | 70.0 | 80.6 |
| Bought portions | 26.7 | 22.3 | 42.6 | 20.1 | 25.5 | 43.3 | 32.8 |
| No，did not buy sea food | 17.6 | 22.0 | 2.1 | 22.7 | 15.5 | 13.3 | 10.4 |

Table 2

DID TEE ESTABLISHMENT BUY FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of EstablishmentPublicEatingPlaces Institutions |  | Sales Voiume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 \\ \text { ond } \\ -\quad \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | (203) | (129) | (74) | (91) | (52) | (29) | (31) |
|  | \% | d | 中 | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 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 |

## Table 3

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \text { " } 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { atd } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Totat | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less } \\ \text { Than } \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 34,499 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Firh | （141） | （54） | （38） | （49） |  | q | \％ | 免 | $\pm$ |
|  | $\underline{L}$ | 考 | 最 | 是 | Haddock． |  |  |  |  |
|  | 200．0＊ | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | Breaded | 18．2 | 14.6 | 4.4 | 5.7 25.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Stears | ． 5 | － | 2.5 | － |
| Carp |  |  |  |  | Cooked ard treaded | ． | － | － | 2.3 |
| Raw | ． 5 | － | － | 1.1 | Breaded fillets | $\therefore .4$ | － | － | 3.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Raw | ．${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 1.1 | － | － |
| Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | ． 5 | 1.1 | － | － | Hal but |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Fillets | 5.7 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 5.7 |
| Cod |  |  |  |  | Steaks | 1.4 | － | － | 3.4 |
| Breaded | 1.4 | － | 4.6 | － | Raw | 5 | 1.1 | － | － |
| Fillets | 5.4 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked and breaded | ． 7 | － | － | 2.3 | Lake Perch |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded fillote | ． 8 | － | 4.6 | 3.4 | RgW | 5 | － | 1.5 | － |
| H：1w |  | 1.1 | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Ma－ker： 1 |  |  |  |  |
| F＇lominder |  |  |  |  | Filieta |  | 12．4 | $\cdots$ | 12． 5 |
| Greaded |  | － | － | 1.1 | Steaks | 4 | － | $4 . t$ | － |
| Fillatic | ${ }^{\prime}$. | t | $+2$ | 205 | R2w |  | － 2 | － | ＋． |
| Breadet fillete |  |  | － | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Table 3
（Contd．）

## FROCEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN IHOVEMEER， 1958 －HOW FROCESEED BEFORE PURCHASE

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less } \\ \text { Than } \\ \$ 120.000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,499 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less } \\ \text { Than } \\ \$ 10,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.000- \\ -27,190 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{Z}$ | I | 回 | 是 |  | 1 | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{L}$ | 免 |
| $\frac{\text { Mullet }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | ． 9 | 1.1 | － | 1.1 | $\frac{\text { Sea }}{\text { Filises }}$ | ．+ | － | 3.1 | － |
| Rew | 1.4 | 4.5 | － | － | $\frac{\text { Smelts }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | ．${ }^{\text {r }}$ | － | － | 1.2 |
| $\frac{\text { Ocean Perch }}{\text { Brexded }}$ | 5 | 1.1 | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 70.8 | 05. | 75.4 | 48.9 | Sole |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked and breaded | ． 5 | 1.1 | － | － | FIJEte | 4 | － | － | $2 . ?$ |
| Breaded fillets | 38 | 3.4 | 15 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | ． 5 | － | － | 1.1 | $\frac{\text { Swordtizh }}{\text { Sterrs }}$ | 4.2 | － | － | 10.2 |
| Red Snapper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fílets | 2.8 | $2{ }^{2}$ | － | 4.5 | Trat |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | ． 5 | － | 1.5 | － | $\text { F1ll }+E$ | \％ | － | 4.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & 1.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 1. | － | － | 8.4 | Whitimt |  |  |  |  |
| Steal．z | $=$ | － | Hoz | 9.0 | Sterks | $\cdots$ | 1 | $\because$ | － |


(2) Firthaigs were ot reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.
(h) Less than half a pound.
(a) In"lude abani-h manterel; one hotel boust a large quantity.

|  | Total Users $\qquad$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchases of Cod | $\underline{\%}$ 100.0 |  | Total Users $\qquad$ |
| Prefer more prepreparation of cod | - |  | d |
| Prefer less prepreparation of cod | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 88.0 | Total Purchases of Mackerel | 100 |
| No answer | 12.0 |  |  |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of mackerel |  |
|  |  | Prefer less prepreparation of mackerel |  |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | F |
| Total Purchases of Flounder | 100.0 | No answer | 1 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of flounder | - |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of flounder | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 95.0 | Total Furchases of Ocean Perch | 100.0 |
| No answer | 5.0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | - |
|  |  | Prefer less prepreparation of ocean perch | - |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 78.1 |
| Total Purchases of Haddock | $\underline{100.0}$ | No answer | 2.9 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of haddock | - |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of haddock | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 98.3 |  |  |
| No answer | 1.7 |  |  |

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

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 courited as two purchases of the species.

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

Table 6

## Bumibriction aid DISSATISFACTIOR

 OF FROZEN FROCESSEEI FIS:


Toter
(141)

Saplsfled
DISSatistied

No answer

## 



Table 8

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROCFN
PROCESSED FISH PACKAGES
Total
Total Users of Frozen Processed
Fish，November， 1959

Satisfied
Dissatisfied

Don＇t know

Table 9

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

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10.000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.000- \\ 39.999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \＄40，000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | （141） | （54） | （38） | （49） |
|  | \％ | 中 | \％ | \％ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  |  |  |  |
| None fried | 7.0 | 11.2 | 6.2 | 3.4 |
| 1－14\％ | － | － | － | － |
| 15－34\％ | 3.3 | 4.5 | － | 4.5 |
| 35－64\％ | 20.7 | 14.6 | 24.6 | 23.9 |
| 05－84\％ | 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 | 549 | 585 | 67.7 | 42.1 |
| 1－14\％ | 7.0 | 12.4 | 40 | 3.4 |
| 15－34\％ | 9.5 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 17.1 |
| 35－04\％ | 116 | 78 | 185 | 10.2 |
| 65－84\％ | 17 | 4.5 | － | － |
| Over 84\％ | 2.5 | 45 | 1.5 | 11 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，relused | 12.8 | 4.5 | 6.2 | 20．1 |
| Average percentage served | 134 | 149 | 12 C | 14.3 |
| Estaklishments Serving Eaked |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | ntis | 831 | $i=4$ | 433 |
| 1－14 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1.2 | － | － | 3.4 |
| 15－34\％ | ？ 9 | 34 | 77 | 12.5 |
| 35－64\％ | 8 | 3.4 | 22 | 125 |
| us－84w | ． 4 | － | － | 11 |
| $0 \cdot \because 54$ | 20 | 5.8 | 15 | 1.1 |
| I＇to brio no andwer，refused | 12.8 | 45 | 62 | ． |
| A | 11. | 81 | H． 2 | 1 |
|  <br> －$\sigma_{2}$ <br> 144 <br> 动 |  |  |  |  |
| 1－1！ | 12 | － | 45 | － |
| 15－表 | － | － | － | － |
| $35 \cdots$ | － | － | － | － |
| 05－．${ }^{\text {a }}$ | － | － | － | － |
| Over $5+4$ | 日 | 11 | 1．${ }^{5}$ | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 128 | 4.5 | b 2 | 20． 1 |
| Averace furcentage served | 10 | 1.1 | 1 ， | － |

## FROZEN PROCESEE SHELLFISH BOUGHT III NOVHMERR, ...

## HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE

|  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | (1u) |  |
|  | 18 |  |
|  | 100. |  |
|  |  | 0ysers |
| Clams |  | Bresdel |
| Raw; :lean | t. | Crnomed |
| Raw, -lean |  | Rav: slean, shelled |
| Crats |  |  |
| Cooked | - | Scall Pr |
| Breaded | 1.5 | Breaded |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.5 | Raw; clean, shelled |
| Cooked and deviled | 1.5 |  |
| Cooked and shredded | . 5 | Bhrimp |
| Breaded rolls | 1.5 | C Died |
| Deviled and stuffed | 3. | Preaded |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | '. . ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$, | Colved and breaded <br> Dehealed, raw in shells |
| Paw; whole, clean | 12. | Broken pieces |
| Lobster |  | Raw; lean, deheaded, shelled and deveined |
| Cooked | 5 |  |
| Breaded | $\cdot$ |  |
| Cooked and shredded tail. | $\cdots$ |  |
| Cleaned and deheades tail: | 4. |  |
| Raw; whole, clean | 11. |  |

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


Table 12

## SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPREFARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

|  | Total Users $\qquad$ |  | $\cdots+1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | z |  | * |
| Total Purahases of Crabs | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Scellops | 80.5 |
| Prefer more prepreparstion of crabs |  | Prefer more prepreparation of scailors |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of crats |  | Prefer less prepreparation of scallops |  |
| Prefer frepreparation as it is | 100.0 | Prefer prepreparation as it is |  |
| Total Purchases of Lobster | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Shrimp | - |
| Prefer more prepreparation of lotster | - | Prefer more prepreparation of shrimp |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of lobster |  | Prefer less prepreparation of shrimp | 5 |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 100.0 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 97.5 |
| Total Purchases of Oysters | 100.0 |  |  |
| Prefer more prepreparstion of oysters | - |  |  |
| Prefer less mrepreparation of oysters | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer | 3.8 6.2 |  |  |

(1) The fierzentages shown in the body of the taile are computed on the total numter of purchases of each species of shellfish
Mary ustriblument = 'ought more than one species. Some estat listment: Also loupht a epecies frepred in two different ways. For faxthla, ahrmp trequed and shrimp cooked This was countel as two iurchan of the species
 wern for in 4 ander, tlay are not incluled in the table

## Table 13

# SATESFACTION AKD DISSATISFACTION 

WIWH QUALITY AND CONDITION OF
FROZE: PROCESSED SHELIFISH

Total Users of Frozer Frosessec - Srellfish. Novemter, $\because 750$


Table 14
(Contd.)

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

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

Sometimes figures are stown for puckage sizes but not average rumber of servings per pound hathese faties the lintir on servings per round $1 s$ limitet.

Thus whentipes in the bory of the table are bisel on 1.t M...... ot estathishmertes whoth homght ore species
ul 4.alf..h, freprepmred in one mamer

Table 15

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH PACKAGES

tal Users of Frozen
Processed Shellfish

Satisfied
Dissatisfied

No answer

PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROESSED SHELLFISH SERVED FRIED 2 EROLIED. BAKED, AND IT OTHER WAYS

| Total Users of Froze: Processer Shellizat | Potal <br> (103) | Tothi Uuers of Frozer. Processed Shellf st | $\frac{\text { Total }}{\text { (193) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 智 |  | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 10C.C |  | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  | Establishments Serving Baked |  |
| None fried | 1.5 | None baked | 60.1 |
| 1-24 2 | 1.5 | 1-14\% | 5, |
| 15-34\% | 2.5 | 15-34\% | 10.0 |
| 35-54\% | 1-. | 3-04\% | E.C |
| 65-84t | E®. | bic - 54 | - |
| Over $24 \%$ | 29.1 | Over 54. | $\cdots$ |
| Don't know, nc answer, refused | 10.5 | Dor 't funju, no answer, refuse ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 16. . |
| Average percentage servea | 73.5 | Average Fersentage servod | 4. 1 |
| Establisnnents Serving Broiled |  | Establishments Serving ir Other Way |  |
| None broiled | 64. 5 | None in other ways | 59.0 |
| 1-14\% | 3.5 | 1-14\% | 2.0 |
| 15-34\% | 16. 0 | 15-34\% | 15.5 |
| 35-54\% | 4.5 | 35-54\% | 5.6 |
| 65-84\% | 1.0 | 15-84\% | - |
| 0rer 84\% | - | Over $84 \%$ | 2.0 |
| Don't know, no arswer. refured | 16.5 | ton't know, no answer, refuzed | 16.5 |
| Average percentgen served | 6.6 | Average percentage served | +. 9 |
| Note: Persentages, other than average furnentaces, are based on total establishmerts interviewer. Averaze peroentaces are computed ky assiening the zazes in any one of the six intervals to the midfoint of the interval, ant thitu ar querage of all the usies. |  |  |  |


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

Table 19

AMOUNT OF PORTIONS BOUGHT BY ESTABLISHMENTS,
AS COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR
According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Fortions | (65) | (33) | (32) |
|  | \% | \% | 中 |
|  | 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 |

Table 20

SATISFACTION AND DISSAT ISFACT ION WITH
QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS

Total
Total Purchases of Types of
Fortions, November, 1958

Satisfied
Dissatisfied

No answer

Table 21

IS THE QUALITY OF PORTIONS BETTER THAN THAT OF OTHER
FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?

Table 22

## ADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

Total Users of Portions, November, 1958

Size of portions - uniform, controlled
serving, the right size service

Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor,
already prepared

Economical - no waste ..... 25.2
Fast, 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

Table 23

DISADVANTAGES OF USING PURTIONS


Table 24

DO ESTABLISHMENTS THINK CUSTOMERS PREFER PORTIONS TO OTHER FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REACONS?

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (65) |
|  | 営 |
|  | 100.0 |
| Think customers like portions better | 27.8* |
| Uniform controlled servings - always the same anount | 13.0 |
| Attractive - eye appealing | 7.8 |
| Custoners order - seem to like them | 4.3 |
| Faster quicker to serve - no waiting | 2.6 |
| No bones - safer for children | 2.6 |
| Economical | 1.7 |
| Don't know - no answer | 1.7 |
| Thirk rustomers like portions less | 2.6 |
| Think astomers lite mortions about the same | 44, 6 |
| Don't Fnow | 10.5 |
| No ariswer | 35 |

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

Table 25

AVERAGE WEIGHT OF PORIIONS AND AVERAGE NLMBER OF SERVINGS PER PACKAGE

Total users of prtions, November. 19 ad
Average weight of parcage ot purtimas, in pounds
Averago number servings per package
Average weight if individual servings, int ounces
Average weight of individua portions, in ounces

Note: Average weight if purtions does not equat average weigtt of individual servings since some afrators ot tained more than one serving froth a fortion, whice ther operators usei mo that ine frtin for a serving.

Table 26

SATISFACTION WITH THF SIZE OF PORTIONS IN A PACKAGE

## Total

Total Users of Portions

PERCENTAGE OF FOFTISE SERVED FRIET，EROILEL．FRHED，ADD IN OTIEK WAYB
Aceording to TuFe I Extrulishment

|  | Tutal | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions |  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eatine } \\ & \text { Place } \end{aligned}$ | Irratitutines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | （0）${ }^{\circ}$ | （3） | （5） | Tutal Users Ertions | （65） | （3） | －32） |
|  | \％ | 最 | d |  | 者 | \％ | 退 |
|  | 1020 | 100.0 | 100． |  | 100．0 | 110 | 10. |
| Establishments Servine Fried |  |  |  | Establishmentiosevine |  |  |  |
| None fried | 23.9 | 1.3 | $3: .5$ | －nat bated | 73.9 | 85.4 | 52.5 |
| $1-14 \%$ | 1． | － | － | 1－1垠 | 9．9 | 5 | 25 |
| 15－34\％ | 14.8 | 14.7 | 15.0 | 15－34\％ | 6.1 | 5 ： | 7.5 |
| 35－64\％ | 7.0 | 5.3 | 20.0 | 35－64\％ | 4.3 | 5.3 | $2=$ |
| 65－84\％ | 10.4 | 12.0 | T． 5 | 65－84\％ | 6.1 | 4.0 | 10.9 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 53.9 | 66.7 | 30.0 | Over $94 \%$ | 8.7 | － | 25.4 |
| Average percentage served | 04.7 | 76.8 | 42.0 | Average percentage served | 16.3 | 0.4 | $\therefore 8$ |
| Establishments Serving Erailed |  |  |  | Establishments Serping in |  |  |  |
| None br iled | 1－3 | 77.3 | 02.5 | Other Ways |  |  |  |
| $1-14 \%$ | $\pm 3$ | 2 | 75 | None in other ways | 100.0 | 100.6 | 100.0 |
| 15－34 3 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 10.0 | 1－14\％ | － | － | － |
| $35-648$ | － | 9．3 | 10.0 | 15－3 | － | － | － |
| 65－84\％ | 7 | 40 | ， | －－－ 4.4 | － | － | － |
| Over 84\％ | 3.5 | － | 10.0 |  | － | － | － |
| Average persentage served | 121 | 3.4 | $1{ }^{\text {T，}}$ | Over $84{ }^{\text {a }}$ | － | － | － |
|  |  |  |  | Average percentage sevved |  | － | － |

## Table 28

DO ESTABLISHMENTS COOK PORTIONS WHILE STILL FROZEN:
According to Type of Establishment

|  | 'rotai | Public Eatine Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (65) | (33) | (32) |
|  | \% | q | q |
|  | 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 USIMC PORTIONS, AS COMPAFED TO OTHER FROZEH PROCFSSED FISH
AND REASONS WHY PORTIONS ARE THOUGHT YORE CP LESS EXPENSIVE
Say portions more expensive
Cost is more for amount of serving
Price includes processing snd packaging - prefrepa-
ration would tend to raise cost
Don't know - no snswer

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

Table 30

WHEN ORDER ING FORTIONS FROM SUFPLIERS, DO ESTABL ISHMENTS
SFEC IFY THE KIND OF FISH?
According to Type of Establishment

Specify kind of fish
Do not specify kind of fist

| Total | Putlic Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (65) | (33) | (32) |
| d | \& | 中 |
| 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 95.7 | 947 | 97.5 |
| 4.3 | 5.3 | 2.5 |

Table 31

WOUD THE ESTABLISHMENTS LIYE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION CONTROLLED SEA FOOD ITEMS NOT NOW AVA ILABLE?

According to Type of Establishment


## Table 32



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

## Table 33

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen $\qquad$ | (180) | (73) | (50) | (57) |
|  | \% | 中 | \% | \% |
|  | $100.0 *$ | 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 | - |

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

## Table 34

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) |
|  | 最 | \% | \% |
|  | 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 arswer | 1.9 | 1.3 | 4.4 |

FREQUENCY OF DELIVERIES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,009 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$40, cud } \\ & \text { and } \\ & 0 \text { over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen $\qquad$ | (180) | (112) | (68) | (73) | (50) | (57) |
|  | 中 | 中 | \% | \% | \% | E |
|  | 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 | 146 | 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 | 5.6 |
| 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 | - | - |

Table 36

CAN SUPPLIERS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD DMPROVE SERVICES TO ESTABLISHMENTS:
Accoriing to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> \$10,000 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000 \\ 39.999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (180) | (73) | (50) | (57) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can improve services | 3.5 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 2.8 |
| No, Cannot improve services | 946 | 95.7 | 943 | 33.5 |
| Don't know | 1.6 | 1.7 | - | 2.8 |
| No answer | . 3 | - | - | 9 |

## Table 37

AMOUNT SPENT FOR FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD DURING PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS
According to Sales Volume

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

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

According to Sales Volume

| Total Users of Frozen |  | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Processed Sea Food | (180) | (73) | (50) | (57) |
|  | 中 | 中 | \% | \$ |
|  | $\underline{100.0 *}$ | 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 estaklishments | 23.4 | 29.9 | 21.6 | 17.8 |
| Don't know | 35.6 | 31.6 | 31.8 | +5.8 |
| No answer | 12.5 | 13.7 | 14.8 | 9.3 |

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


## Table 39

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS KNOW THEY CAN BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD:

Accoraing to Type of Establishment

|  | Total |  | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (180) | (112) | (68) |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 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 |

## Table 40

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR

## GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishment

| Total Establishments | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available | (153) | (92) | (61) |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 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 |

Table 41

REASONS ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD
According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Fublic <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchasers of Government Inspected or Graded Sea Food | (150) | (91) | (59) |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
|  | $100.0{ }^{*}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| pected foods are safe - pure, , no germs or disease use better products, more | 35.8 | 33.7 | 41.4 |
| ity | 33.5 | 31.0 | 40.0 |
| lable - it's all inspected, supplier carries | 21.8 | 25.7 | 11.4 |
| it | 2.7 | 3.7 | - |
| - easy to serve, ready to n controlled | 2.3 | 1.6 | 4.3 |
| al | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| s that it's bought | . 8 | - | 2.9 |
| ent inspected - wouldn't r | 4 | - | 1.4 |
|  | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| answer | 10.9 | 11.8 | 8.6 |

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


## Table 42

HAS GOVERTMETT INGFECTION AFFECTED THE AMOUNT OF FFKZZEN
PROCESSEI SEA FOOD EOUGHT EY THE ESTARLISHMENT:
According to Type of Establistment

| Total Users of Government Inspected Frozen Processed Dea Food | Total <br> (150) | Public <br> Eating <br> Flaces <br> (1) | $\frac{\text { Irstioutat }}{}$ | Total Establishrents Not Knowing Government Inspected or Graded Frazen Processed Sea Food Was Available | Total (27) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 为 | E | q |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 中 } \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Buy more | 5.8 | 48 | 86 | Say they would buy mor | 12.5 |
| Buy about the same | 79.8 | 78.1 | 84.3 | Say they would buy less | - |
| Buy less | - | - | - | About the same | 33.3 |
| Don't know | 14.0 | 17.1 | 5.7 | Don't know | 45.9 |
| No answer | - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | - | 14 | No answer | 8.3 |

Total
Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food ..... (i3)
袁
100.0
Have served frozen processed sea frod before42
No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customersprefer other foodsLacked flavor - own prepared fish has better flavor
Have not served frozen processed sea food before ..... 43 3*
Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, notin that business
No storage facilities - no freezer ..... 1E.O04. 7Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, freshfish available all yearUnable to handle preparation - no equipment, notenough room, no time. would need extra help8467lite taste, freshness of fresh fish - don't trust
frocen foal, fresh fish tastes better, some frozenis kept too long${ }_{5} 0$
I-T + rnow, no answer ..... 1 -
unt Enow ..... 25

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


## Table 45

|  | $10 \leq 5$ | Thue f Estan？ishmer： |  | Saies Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\qquad$ | ristitutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Thai: } \\ & \$ \mathrm{~S}, \mathrm{i} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ※1こ $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 42.001- \\ \hline 2.005 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Totus E＋akinshmeris | （2，3） | 315\％ | ：TE： | 124 | TE： | ， 3 e， | $:^{2=}$ |
|  | \％ | $\underline{1}$ | 安 | 是 | E | \％ | 星 |
|  | $\underline{12}$ | 107 | 100.6 | 20.5 | 100. | $\underline{20}$ | 10．．． |
| Yes，have ccia stomer sa．ilitee | $\therefore 3$ | $E=$ ． | 27.2 | 78.4 | 82.3 | 33.3 | L． |
| Ins，do not have arid strage igeilities | 16.5 | 27.5 | 2天．ê | 21.6 | 18． 2 | E．－ | 8.0 |
| No answer | ．$=$ | ．－ | － | － | － | － | 3.0 |
| Averuse capacity，in cuit see | 52. | $\pm$ | 100.4 | 29.3 | 21.0 | 42.8 | （y） |

## Table 46

DO ESTABLISIMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN FROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Nonusers of Sea Food and Users Not Ising Frozen Processed Sea Food

|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Nonusers } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sea Food } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Users Not <br> Using <br> Frozen <br> Frocessed <br> Sea Food |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (63) |  |  |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ | 63.9 | 36.1 |
| 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



|  | N10さを | $\begin{aligned} & P_{101} \\ & \text { Eatiry } \\ & \text { Flaye } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To':2] Eratardiscmar.: | '2-1 | : $\square^{-7}$ | $\cdots$ |
|  | i | 5 | - |
| Total Receipts | 10... | 10 c | 10. |
| Less thsu. \$10,00 | 45. | 45. | 52.2 |
| \$10.005-34.999 | 25.5 | 26.1 | 23.4 |
| \$re.006-29.005 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.8 |
| \$15, in and over | 155 | 16.9 | 15.E |

Table b

AMOUNT ESTABLISHMENTS SPENT FOR FOOD DURING PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \end{aligned}$ Places | Institutions | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less } \\ \text { Than } \\ \$ 10,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \end{gathered}$ | \$40,000- $99,999$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (243) | (167) | (76) | (114) | (62) | (32) | (35) |
|  | \% | 中 | \% | \% | 中 | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$1,000 | 7.2 | 10.0 | - | 13.7 | - | - | - |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 17.0 | 22.8 | 2.0 | 30.4 | 4.3 | - | - |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 10.4 | 8.5 | 15.4 | 19.0 | 2.2 | - | - |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 18.6 | 14.4 | 28.6 | 24.3 | 19.6 | 9.4 | - |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 14.2 | 12.1 | 19.2 | 5.3 | 41.4 | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 11.4 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 7.3 | 23.9 | 14.3 | - |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 9.6 | - | 8.6 | 57.1 | 14.4 |
| \$50,000-99.999 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 5.8 | - | - | 14.3 | 14.4 |
| \$100,000-249,999 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 5.8 | - | - | - | 38.0 |
| \$250,000 and orer | 3.2 | 3.9 | 2.0 | - | - | - | 28.4 |

Table c

## PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OPERATIDG COST SPENT FOR FOOD IN PREVIOUS TWEIVE MONTHS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | LessThan$\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | Eating |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Places | Institutions |  |  |  |  |
| Total Establishments | （243） | （167） | （76） | （114） | （62） | （32） | （35） |
|  | \％ | q | 中 | \％ | \％ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under 5\％for food | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |
| 5－14\％ | 7.1 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 3.8 | 21.2 | － | － |
| 15－24\％ | 5.7 | 4.6 | 9.7 | 9.0 | － | 7.7 | － |
| 25－34\％ | 25.0 | 23.9 | 29.0 | 28.2 | 24.3 | 7.7 | 25.0 |
| 35－44\％ | 24.3 | 28.5 | 9.7 | 16.7 | 27.3 | 7.7 | 68.8 |
| 45－54\％ | 14.3 | 16.5 | 6.5 | 15.4 | 12.1 | 30.7 | － |
| 55－64\％ | 3.7 | － | 16.1 | 6.4 | － | － | － |
| 65－74\％ | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |
| 75－84\％ | 17.1 | 17.4 | 16.1 | 17.9 | 12.1 | 46.2 | － |
| 85－94\％ | 2.1 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 | － | 6.2 |
| 95－100\％ | ． 7 | － | 3.2 | 1.3 | － | － | － |

Table d

AVERAGE NUMRER OE MEALS SERVED R: ESTABLISHMENTS
According to Type of Establishment and Stles V ilume


* Less than one half meal.

AVERAGE PRICE PER MEAL SERVED
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (243) | (167) | (76) | (114) | (62) | (32) | (35) |
|  | $\underline{\text { d }}$ | 中 | $\underline{\text { q }}$ | q | $\underline{8}$ | $\underline{\text { q }}$ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Under \$. 25 | 5 | 6 | - | 1.0 | - | - | - |
| \$.25-.49 | 13.2 | 5.6 | 40.4 | 20.1 | 15.5 | - | 1.5 |
| \$. $50-.74$ | 20.9 | 24.9 | 6.4 | 34.7 | 14.5 | 8.3 | 3.0 |
| \$.75-.99 | 23.6 | 28.7 | 5.3 | 21.1 | 31.9 | 23.3 | 17.9 |
| \$1.00-1.49 | 15.3 | 19.3 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 20.0 | 33.4 | 28.4 |
| \$1.50-1.99 | 3.2 | 4.2 | - | . 5 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 11.9 |
| \$2.00-2.49 | 1.9 | 2.4 | - | . 5 | - | 5.0 | 6.0 |
| \$2.50-2.99 | 2.1 | 2.7 | - | 1.0 | - | 3.3 | 7.5 |
| \$3.00-3.99 | . 5 | . 6 | - | - | 1.8 | - | - |
| \$4.00-4.99 | - | - |  |  |  | - | - |
| \$5.00 and over | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 |

Total establishments

Average number per establishment

| Totel | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \end{aligned}$ | \$100,000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 243 | 114 | 02 | 32 | 35 |

## Table g

## SEATING CAPACITY OF ESTABLISHMENTS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of | Establishment |  | Sales | Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Estatioshment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (243) | (167) | (76) | (114) | (62) | (32) | (35) |
|  | 中 | 中 | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 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 | $43 \cdot 3$ | 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 | - | - | - | $3 \cdot 3$ | 3.0 |


|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39.999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (243) | (114) | (62) | (32) | (35) |
|  | E | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 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 | 5.8 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 8.3 | 13.4 |
| Chicken specialty | 2.8 | 3.6 | 4.5 | - | - |
| Barbecue | 2.6 | - | 5.5 | 8.3 | - |
| Sea food | 1.6 | - | . 9 | 3.3 | 6.0 |
| Kosher | - 9 | 1.5 | - | 1.7 | - |
| French food | . 7 | - | - | - | 4.5 |
| Chinese food | - 5 | - | 1.8 | - | 1 |
| Italian food | . 5 | - | - | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| All others | 1.4 | . 5 | 1.8 | - | 4.5 |

