FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

AND SHELLFISH CONSUMPTION

IN INSTITUTIONS

AND

PUBLIC EATING PLACES

———•———

**Survey Methods
and
Procedures**

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

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

-------------o-------------

SURVEY METHODS AND PROCEDURES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. PURPOSE OF STUDY

The over-all purpose of this survey was to obtain data that could be used by the fishing industry to increase consumer demand for fish and shellfish.

In recognition of the importance of the mass feeding industry as a potential market for frozen fishery products this survey was undertaken among institutional and public eating places.

The data collected should be useful in helping processors of frozen fish, shellfish, and portions to adjust their operations and services in order to reduce costs, provide better services, and develop new or expanded markets.

Specifically the objectives of this research were to obtain information on the following within each of ten selected cities:

   a. Proportion of establishments using frozen processed sea food in its three forms; fish, shellfish, and portions.

   b. Quantity of purchases of frozen processed sea food; by species and amount of prepreparation.

   c. Sources of supply of frozen processed sea food.

   d. Attitudes toward services of suppliers, quality, condition, packaging, and profitability of frozen processed sea food.

   e. Method of cooking frozen processed sea food.

   f. Awareness and usage of Government inspected frozen processed sea food.

   g. Reasons for not using frozen processed sea food.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Definition of Terms

1. Frozen Processed Sea Food

Any sea food (fish or shellfish, fresh, or salt water) which has been processed to some degree and frozen prior to delivery to the eating establishment. Processed, in this sense, means that the sea food has been cleaned, shelled, precooked, breaded, or prepared in some other way.

2. Frozen Processed Fish

All species of fish which meet the definition of frozen processed sea food. This division excludes shellfish and portion controlled sea foods regardless of species.

3. Frozen Processed Shellfish

All species of shellfish which meet the definition of frozen processed sea food. This division excludes fish items and portion controlled sea foods regardless of species.

4. Portion Controlled Sea Food (Also called "Portions")

Any species of sea food fillets, usually bottom fish, which are frozen into a large mass and then cut into rectangular pieces of equal size. One or more of these pieces or "Portions" usually constitute a serving. Prior to delivery to the establishment "Portions" are sometimes further processed by cooking and/ or breading.

B. Questionnaire Design

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries supplied Crossley, S-D
Surveys, Inc. with a detailed list of specific objectives from
which a first draft of the questionnaire was designed. This
draft was presented to various processors for their opinions
and comments, many of which were incorporated in a second
draft. The revised version was then pretested with 57 estab-
lishments in Pittsburgh and Toledo. As a result of the test,
minor changes were made in the wording of several questions
and the sequence was altered to maximize interviewing effi-
ciency.

A copy of the final version of the questionnaire is included at
the end of this circular.

C. Sample Design

For the Frozen Processed Fish and Shellfish Study, there
were selected ten separate probability samples, each one to
represent the public and institutional, nonmilitary, eating
places serving hot, solid food for consumption on the premises
within the corporate limits of each one of ten cities designated
by the Department of the Interior.

Each of the probability samples, except the one for Springfield,
Massachusetts, was selected both from a list of establishments
of the types described above and from clusters of areas within
each city. In Springfield, Massachusetts, an area probability
sample only was used. Wherever both list probability and area
probability samples were selected, no sampling unit had a
double opportunity of being selected because, in effect, all
eating places appearing on the lists were eliminated from the
universe being sampled through the area clusters. The samp-
ling fraction for each type of eating place was the same,
whether it was sampled from the list or from the area coverage.

With respect to the area sampling, it was necessary to divide
each city into sampling units (areas made up of clusters of
adjacent blocks) expected to contain almost equal numbers of
establishments serving hot solid food and belonging to the first
subuniverse (restaurants, hotels, bars, etc.). This was done

3

by plotting on up-to-date city maps a sample of such places, as listed on the most recent directories, and then outlining the boundaries of the areas so that they would enclose equal numbers of plotted establishments and so as to divide the space between two plotted establishments belonging to two different areas approximately equally between the two areas. From the total number of such areas (comprising the whole city), a probability sample of areas was selected and the selected areas were fully canvassed by the field staff.

Below are listed the ten cities used for this study, the number of interviews obtained through the probability area sample, the number of interviews obtained through the probability list sample, and the total number of interviews obtained:

City	Number of Clusters	Number of Interviews		
		Area	List	Total
Atlanta, Georgia	31	204	39	243
Chicago, Illinois	51	764	78	842
Cleveland, Ohio	38	383	27	410
Denver, Colorado	32	164	52	216
Houston, Texas	32	256	32	288
Los Angeles, California	48	562	35	597
New York, New York	71	1,131	40	1,171
Omaha, Nebraska	31	114	60	174
Portland, Oregon	30	250	31	281
Springfield, Massachusetts	30(1)	196	-	196
Totals	394	4,024	394	4,418

(1) All of city was included but it was divided into 30 assignments.

The universe of all public and institutional, nonmilitary, eating places serving hot solid food (for consumption on the premises) was subdivided, for each city, into four subuniverses, as follows:

1. Eating places serving the public at large and principally or importantly concerned with the service of food for consumption on the premises: restaurants, cafeterias, hotels, bars, etc.

2. Eating places serving particular groups of the general public at the place of their principal activity for consumption there: in plant and in school feeding operations.

3. Eating places serving particular "captive" groups in quasi households: food serving facilities in hospitals, nursing homes, asylums, prisons, and "institutions" generally.

4. Eating places of all other types, located in semiprivate organizations or in establishments open to the general public but not principally nor importantly concerned with the service of food for consumption on the premises: food service in clubs, lunch counters, refreshment stands, drugstores, variety stores, other retail establishments, transportation systems, etc.

In all ten cities except Chicago, Illinois and Cleveland, Ohio, the sampling fraction varied from one subuniverse to the other so that samples adequate for analysis purposes could be expected to be produced for all four subuniverses, even though the number of establishments in the four subuniverses varied greatly. (In Chicago, Illinois and Cleveland, Ohio, the number of establishments in the four subuniverses were such that, by taking the

same sampling fraction in all cases, adequate samples could be expected in all four subuniverses.) Because of the different sampling fractions within each city, the samples had to be reweighted so that all the findings could be shown for each city as a whole. As between cities, however, no reweighting was done, since each city involves a separate study with a separate sample. Therefore, even after reweighting, the "tabulating cases" for each city represent a different proportion of its universe, as shown in the following:

City	Total Number of Interviews	Total Number of "Tabulating Cases "After Reweighting	Proportion of Universe Represented by "Tabulating Cases"
Atlanta, Georgia	243	431	1/ 1.56
Chicago, Illinois	842	842	1/ 7.87
Cleveland, Ohio	410	410	1/ 5.00
Denver, Colorado	216	434	1/ 2.87
Houston, Texas	288	536	1/ 2.47
Los Angeles, California	597	874	1/ 4.35
New York, New York	1,171	1,404	1/ 12.20
Omaha, Nebraska	174	275	1/ 1.65
Portland, Oregon	281	363	1/ 2.71
Springfield, Massachusetts	196	221	1/ 1.16
Total	4,418	-	-

The proportions shown in the last column above represent the net effective proportions reflecting the different sampling rates, the reweighting factors applied to offset these different sampling rates, and the different completion rates achieved. The latter are shown in the following table:

City	Completion Rate
	%
Atlanta, Georgia	96
Chicago, Illinois	89
Cleveland, Ohio	80
Denver, Colorado	87
Houston, Texas	81
Los Angeles, California	92
New York, New York	82
Omaha, Nebraska	91
Portland, Oregon	83
Springfield, Massachusetts	86

While the sample was designed so that the "expectation" (based on the available data) would be of a subsample, adequate for separate analysis, for each of four subuniverses, these "expectations" were not always realized. In some cases, the samples produced for certain subuniverses were too small for separate analysis. In such cases, subuniverses No. 1 and No. 4 were merged, and/or subuniverses No. 2 and No. 3, the first two representing, roughly, the "public" eating places and the latter two the "institutional". On this merged basis, adequate samples for analysis were obtained in all cities.

While the list sample was a single-stage sample, the area samples in all cities except Springfield, Massachusetts, were two-stage samples. The first stage was a sampling of areas, as explained above. The second stage was a sampling of the establishments listed by the field staff in their full canvas of the sampled areas. In Springfield, Massachusetts, the area sample, too, was a single-stage sample, because, in the first stage, the

areas selected comprised the whole city, this was necessary because the sample for subuniverse No. 3 (institutions) had to be a 100 percent sample, in order to provide adequate basis for analysis.

Where a two-stage area sample was combined with a single-stage list sample, the sampling fractions for the two stages were so selected as to equal, in combination, the single sampling fraction used for the list sample. In general, the sampling fraction for the first stage in the two-stage area sample was determined by the over-all sampling fraction for subuniverse No. 3 (institutions).

In some cases, supplementary sampling was done within certain sampled areas for certain subuniverses to provide more adequate samples. Thus, one subuniverse within one city was in some cases sampled at more than one rate. These different sampling rates, too, were offset by proper reweighting factors that are reflected in the reweighted "Tabulating Cases" reported above.

D. Data Processing

Each completed questionnaire was checked in against a "Call Record Sheet" to insure that the proper sampling procedure was followed.

In addition each interview was reviewed by a trained editor for completeness, accuracy, consistency, and quality.

Codes for all open questions were developed from a representative subsample of interviews. In the coding operation, standard quality controls were utilized to insure a high level of accuracy. For instance, a record was kept of responses coded into the miscellaneous categories with frequent review to determine whether or not a separate category should be added to the code.

All data were punched onto IBM cards and verification checks were performed in accordance with standard tabulating procedures.

8

Each interview was then given its proper weight by duplication of its punch cards on the basis of the particular sampling rate used in selection of the establishment.

The weighted distribution of responses were then tabulated by machine and percentaged as shown in the Detailed Findings.

E. Reporting

The results of the survey are reported separately for each of ten selected cities.

Four classes and four sizes of establishments were defined for the study and these were used for analysis where the sample size permitted. Where the sample was too small to yield statistically meaningful data, combinations have been made within these indicators.

Below are the basic classifications utilized and in the case of type of operation the most frequently used combination. Combinations within sales volume, where used, are self-explanatory.

Type of Establishment

Class I

Establishments primarily engaged
in serving food to the general
public. (Restaurants, cafeterias,
etc.

Class II

Establishments serving food to
limited groups of people. (Schools,
plants, commercial enterprises,
etc.

9

Class III

Establishments serving food to
captive groups of people. (Hos-
pitals, homes for the handicapped,
prisons, etc.)

Class IV

Miscellaneous Establishments
(Drugstores, lunch counters,
stands, clubs, etc.)

Class I and IV

Public Eating Places

Class II and III

Institutions

Annual Sales Volume

Less than $10,000
$10,000 - 39,999
$40,000 - 99,999
$100,000 and over

Each city's report is presented in three parts:

Summary of Findings

Detailed Findings

Distribution of the Sample

In the Summary of Findings the highlights of the survey are
discussed. It will be noted that for selected findings, reference
has been made to how the results compare with the nine other
cities included in the study.

The detailed findings are presented in the form of percentaged distributions to the responses to various questions asked. While the percentages are based on the weighted number of tabulation cases, the number appearing in parentheses at the head of each column is the actual number of interviews conducted.

Throughout the detailed tabulations a single asterisk (*) has been used to denote that the percentages may add to more than the total or subtotal since some respondents give more than one reply to the question.

Any unusual circumstances relating to the Detailed Findings are explained by footnotes on the tables to which they apply.

With only a few exceptions all of the detailed tables are shown in the same sequence for all ten cities. The exceptions are several cases where the number of respondents was so low that the table had no statistical significance and was therefore not shown.

Tables a through i are a statistical description of the kinds of establishments included in each city sample.

III. RELIABILITY OF STUDY RESULTS

A. Sampling Error

Standard Error of the Proportions

For all percentages, the standard error may be estimated by using the formula for simple random sampling (the symbol "d" denotes standard deviation),

$$dp = \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n}}$$

and making appropriate adjustments for estimated loss of statistical efficiency of the sample due to clustering and for the gain due to stratification and the finite population factor.

The estimated adjustment factors for all ten cities in this survey are submitted in the following table together with the total number of completed interviews for each city as shown in the section on Sample Design.

	Adjustment Factor	Total Number of Interviews
Atlanta, Georgia	0.90	243
Chicago, Illinois	1.33	842
Cleveland, Ohio	1.07	410
Denver, Colorado	1.05	216
Houston, Texas	1.03	288
Los Angeles, California	1.19	597
New York, New York	1.44	1,171
Omaha, Nebraska	0.88	174
Portland, Oregon	0.98	281
Springfield, Massachusetts	0.52	196
Total		4,418

Following are examples of how the table should be used.

The proportion of all public and institutional eating places in Denver, Colorado, that bought frozen processed sea food in the preceding 12 months is 58.8 percent (Denver Table 1, Column 1, Line 4); this percentage is based on the total Denver sample of 216 eating places (ibidem, line 1 and table above, line 4). Applying the formula for simple random sampling, we get:

$$dp = \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{.588 \times .412}{216}} = \sqrt{\frac{.242256}{216}} = \sqrt{.0011216} = .0335$$

Applying the adjustment factors shown in the table above, line 4, we estimate the error of the proportion as follows:

$$dp = 1.05 \times .0335 = .035175 \text{ (say .036)}$$

This means that the chances are, 2 out of 3, that if all eating places in Denver had been interviewed with the same techniques used in this survey this proportion would have fallen between .588 + .036 and .588 — .036, or between 62.4 percent and 55.2 percent.

The above procedure is followed when the "base" for the percentage whose standard error is desired is the same as the total number of interviews according to the last column in the table above. In other cases, the following slightly modified procedure is followed.

The proportion of all public and institutional eating places in Denver, Colorado, with annual sales volume of less than $10,000, that bought frozen processed sea food in the preceding 12 months is 39.6 percent (Denver Table 1, column 4, line 4); this percentage is based on a Denver subsample of 87 eating places (Ibidem, line 1), which is not the total Denver sample of 216 places (see table above, line 4). First we must adjust the percentage to express it as a proportion of the total sample, as follows:

39.6% x 87 (size of subsample) = 34.452

34.452 ÷ 216 (size of total sample) = 16.0%

Applying the formula for simple random sampling:

$$dp = \sqrt{\frac{.16 \times .84}{216}} = \sqrt{\frac{.1344}{216}} = \sqrt{.00062222} = .02494$$

Applying the adjustment factor from the first column of the preceding table above, line 4,

$$dp = 1.05 \times .02494 = .026187 \text{ (say .0262)}$$

This is the standard error as a proportion of the total sample and must be converted back to represent a proportion of the subsample.

.0262 x 216 (size of total sample) = 5.6592

5.6592 ÷ 87 (size of subsample) = .06505 (say .065)

This means that chances are, two out of three, that if all eating places in Denver had been interviewed with the same techniques used in this survey, this proportion would have fallen between .396 + .065 and .396 - .065, or between 33.1 percent and 46.1 percent.

Below are the standard errors of the proportion estimated for the corresponding percentages in all ten cities:

	Standard Error of the Proportion	
	Percentage of All Eating Places That Bought Frozen Processed Sea Food	Percentage of Eating Places With Annual Sales Volume Under $10,000 That Bought Frozen Processed Sea Food
Atlanta, Georgia	.026	.055
Chicago, Illinois	.022	.048
Cleveland, Ohio	.025	.029
Denver, Colorado	.036	.065
Houston, Texas	.030	.063
Los Angeles, California	.024	.037
New York, New York	.018	.021
Omaha, Nebraska	.030	.072
Portland, Oregon	.029	.043
Springfield, Massachusetts	.019	.037

Standard Errors of the Mean or Total

The standard errors of the quantities shown in certain tables (as for instance, total quantity purchased of a particular item of fish or shellfish) are naturally larger than the standard errors of the proportions. For this reason, and because response error may be high--when respondents recollect quantities of items purchased--standard errors of the quantities have not been computed.

It should be noted, also, that in computing standard errors of the quantities, the adjustment factors listed above cannot be applied. It is necessary to ascertain adjustment factors for each individual fish or shellfish item purchased, inasmuch as the number of establishments purchasing each item will vary with the individual case.

B. Nonresponse Error

Nonresponse error occurs when an establishment falls in a probability sample, but no interview can be completed at the establishment. To the extent that nonrespondents are different from respondents the survey results might have been altered had the nonrespondents been included in the interviewed sample.

The completion rate for each city is given in Section II-C, Sample Design. It varies from 80 percent in Cleveland to 96 percent in Atlanta. These completion rates are relatively high indicating that nonresponse error has been held to a minimum.

As a standard part of field procedure, repeated call backs were made to those establishments when no interview was completed at the time of the first visit. These procedures substantially reduced the number of noncompleted interviews, and lowered the possibility of nonresponse error.

Where no interview was completed after repeated call backs, several factors were operating:

1. Absence of the proprietor or a qualified representative, during the period of the field work.

2. Preoccupation of the proprietor with the Christmas rush, year-end inventories, or clerical work.

3. In the case of some schools, closing of the schools for vacation during part of the period of field work.

4. Lack of interest in the study, on the part of some proprietors. Some establishments served only a minimum of hot solid food, and seldom if ever used frozen processed sea food.

Nonresponse error is one of a number of factors affecting the statistical significance of the findings. It is not taken into account in the computation of tolerances, discussed in Section III-A, Sampling Error.

C. Response Errors

While not measurable, response errors are likely to exist where answers to questions are of a reasoning or quantitative nature. Such errors may be defined as those introduced into a study when respondents consciously or unconsciously give superficial and/or incomplete answers to questions which require reasons or numerical answers.

Response errors in this study are more likely to occur in numerical estimates since the only source generally available is memory of detailed material by the respondents.

For want of any other guiding principle, one must assume that these errors are randomly distributed.

On the other hand, predominant errors may exist in quantitative responses in the smaller establishments since their records would tend to be less complete than those of larger establishments. However, the effect of quantities erroneously reported by small establishments would tend to be tempered by the greater weight of quantities given by large establishments.

The questionnaire and interviewer training are the main ways
of controlling response error. On this study, it is considered
that the questionnaire, field training, and supervision were
such that response error was held to a minimum considering
the nature of the data being collected.

The cause of response errors may be one or a combination of
the two following factors:

1. Personal psychological motivations

2. Definition problems

The first factor may cause a respondent to give superficial
estimates or reasons due to embarrassment when he lacks
knowledge about a subject of which he feels he should be aware.

Examples of such responses on this study are listed below:

1. Statements that all frozen processed sea
    food is Government inspected.

2. Placing type of fish in wrong categories
    (i.e., codfish cakes under Portion Con-
    trolled Sea Food).

3. "Top of the head" estimates as to package
    sizes, number of servings per package,
    and refrigeration capacities.

Other psychological motivations such as disinterest, dislike,
laziness, and other similar feelings result in superficial
answers in that the respondent feels that his estimate is as
accurate as the records and thus eliminates the laborious task
of looking up the necessary data. In addition, various person-
ality quirks affect the respondents attitude as to the type of
establishment which he operates.

Definition problems may cause a respondent to react as des-
cribed above, or he may unconsciously give incomplete or

erroneous answers due to his misinterpretation of the termi-
nology employed or lack of adequate concentration to the
question which is asked. This becomes apparent in situations
such as the following:

1. Confusion of answers between questions
    where "types and sizes" of packages are
    considered as opposed to subsequent
    questions referring to "quality and con-
    dition" of the product.

2. Confusing steaks and fillets in regard to
    type of fish.

3. Considering fresh fish as frozen pro-
    cessed fish by virtue of the fact that the
    fresh fish is packed in ice.

4. Giving weekly figures for meals served
    or giving Friday totals in the case of
    fish meals in lieu of average daily meals
    served.

5. Respondents, when proprietors, counting
    themselves as employees.

6. Discrepancies between number of meals
    served and total receipts (this may also
    result from personal psychological
    motivations).

Obvious response errors were either corrected by the editor-
ial staff or returned to the field for clarification.

SURVEY OF EATING PLACES

SECTION A - INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of Interior has asked us to conduct a study among various kinds of eating establishments concerning their use of fish and shellfish. The advice and guidance which you give us will enable the commercial fishery industry to provide you with better products and services.

I would like to speak to the person who is responsible for purchasing the fishery products you use.

1. Have you bought any seafood during the past 12 months? (INCLUDES FRESH, FROZEN OR CANNED FISH OR SHELLFISH)

   Yes   5-1
   No   -2

   IF "NO," SKIP TO SECTION C

2. Have you bought any frozen processed seafood in the past 12 months? (THE ITEM(S) MUST BE PROCESSED AND DELIVERED IN THE FROZEN FORM)

   Yes   -4
   No   -5

   IF "NO," SKIP TO SECTION C

SECTION B - USERS

3. About how often do you get deliveries of frozen processed seafood?

   Every day..............   6-1
   2-4 times per week.....   -2
   Once a week............   -3
   2-3 times per month....   -4
   Once a month...........   -5
   Less than once a month.   -8

4. From what type of supplier do you usually get frozen processed seafood?

   Seafood Processor......   -8
   Seafood Wholesaler.....   -9
   Frozen Food Distributor   -0

   Other_____
          (Specify)

5. How far is your main supplier from this establishment?

   Less than 10 miles.....   7-1
   10-50 miles............   -2
   51-100 miles...........   -3
   More than 100 miles....   -4
   Don't know.............   -5

6a. Can you think of any ways in which any of your frozen processed seafood supplier(s) could improve services to you?

   Yes   -8
   No   -9
   O.K.   -0

   IF "NO" OR "O.K.," SKIP TO QUESTION 7

b. Which suppliers?

   Seafood Processor   8-1
   Seafood Wholesaler.....   -2
   Frozen Food Distributor   -3

   Other_____
          (Specify)

6c. How could the services be improved?_____ 9-

_____

_____

7a. As far as you know can you buy frozen processed seafood that is inspected or graded by the U.S. government?

   Yes   10-1
   No   -2

   IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 8

b. If government inspected or graded frozen processed seafood were available, do you think you would buy more, less or about the same as you do now?

   More...............   -4
   Less...............   -5
   About the same.....   -6
   O.K. ....   -7

c. Why do you say that?_____ 11-

_____

_____(SKIP TO Q. 10)_____

8a. Do you buy any?

   Yes   12-1
   No   -2

   IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 9

b. Why not?_____ 13-

_____

_____(SKIP TO Q. 10)_____

9a. Why do you buy it?_____ 14-

_____

_____

b. Has the government inspection had any effect on the amount of frozen seafood you buy?

   Buy more...........   15-1
   Buy about the same.   -2
   Buy less...........   -3
   O.K. ....   -4

FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

10. What were all the different kinds of frozen processed shellfish that you bought in the month of November?

   None ———16-X
   (SKIP TO Q. 19)

   FOR EACH KIND ASK:

11. How were the _____ processed when you bought
                  (Species)
    them? Were they precooked, breaded or processed in any other way? (DESCRIBE THOROUGHLY)

12. Generally, are you satisfied with the amount of pre-preparation of the _____ or would you
                                  (Species/Form)
    prefer more or less?

   FOR EACH DIFFERENT SPECIES/FORM ASK:

13. What package size did you buy?

14. How many packages did you buy during the month?

15. How many servings do you usually get from this size package.

(10)	(11) Fore i.e. How Processed			(12) Should Be Pre-Prepared -			(13) Pkg. Size Lbs.	(14) No. of Pkgs.	(15) No. Servings Per Pkg.	
	Cooked	Breaded	Other (Specify)	More	Less	As Is				
Clams ☐										16- 17-
Crabs ☐										18- 19-
Lobsters ☐										20-
Oysters ☐										21- 22-
Scallops ☐										23- 24-
Shrimps ☐										25-
Other										26- 27-
Other										28- 29-
Other										30-

16a. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or not with
the types and sizes of the frozen processed shell-
fish packages?

                     Satisfied.......   31-1
                     Dissatisfied....   - 2
                     D.K. ....   - 3

    IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 17

b. In what ways are you dissatisfied? _____ 32-

_____

_____

17a. Are you satisfied or not with the quality and con-
dition of the frozen processed shellfish that you
buy?

                     Satisfied.......   33-1
                     Dissatisfied....   - 2
                     D.K. ....   - 3

    IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 18

b. Why are you dissatisfied? _____ 34-

_____

_____

18. What percentage of the frozen processed shellfish
that you serve are . . . .

                     fried?   % 35-
                     broiled?   36-
                     baked?   37-

          Other _____ ____   38-
                (Specify)   100%

PORTION CONTROLLED SEAFOODS

As you know now you can buy portion controlled seafoods
(pre-formed). By this I mean fish that is frozen and
pre-cut into uniform pieces or servings, ready for
final preparation. For example, fish sticks.

19a. Did you buy any portions like this during
November?
                     Yes   39-1
                     No   - 2

    IF "YES," SKIP TO Q. 20

b. Is there any particular reason why you didn't?
(PROBE) _____ 40-

_____

_____

    IF "HIGH PRICE" OR "HIGH COST" MENTIONED,
    SKIP TO Q. 34

c. Is price or cost one of the reasons for not buying
any?
                     Yes   41-1
                     No   - 2

    SKIP TO Q. 34

20a. What are the principal advantages you can think
of in using portions? _____

_____ _____ 42-

_____ _____ 43-

20b. What are the principal disadvantages? _____ 44-

_____ 45-

_____

21a. Do you think your customers like portions better,
about the same or less than other kinds of frozen
processed fish?
             Like portions better..   46-1
             Like about the same...   - 2
             Like portions less....   - 3
             D.K. ....   - 4

    IF "SAME" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 22

b. Why do you think that? _____ 47-

_____

_____

22a. Considering everything that goes into your total
cost would you say that portions are more expen-
sive, about the same or cheaper to use than other
kinds of frozen processed fish?
             Portions more expensive   48-1
             About the same........   - 2
             Portions cheaper.......   - 3
             D.K. ....   - 4

    IF "SAME" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 23

b. Why is that? _____ 49-

_____

_____

23a. Would you say that the quality of portions is
better, about the same, or poorer than other
kinds of frozen processed fish?
             Portions better   50-1
             About the same.   - 2
             Portions poorer   - 3
             D.K. ....   - 4

    IF "SAME" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 24

b. Why is that? _____ 51-

_____

_____

SHOW CARD A

24. During November which of these types of frozen
fish portions did you buy?

    FOR EACH TYPE ASK:

25. What size package do you buy? (lbs.)

26. How many packages did you buy last month?

27. How many ounces is each portion in this size
package?

28. How many servings do you usually get from this
size package?

29a. Are you satisfied or not with the quality or con-
dition of the portions that you buy?

Type of Portion		(24) Bought Last Month	(25) Pkg. Size (lbs.)	(26) No. of Pkgs.	(27) Portion Size, Oz.	(28) No. Servings Per Pkg.	(29a) Satis- fied	Dis- satis- fied	D.K.	52- 53- 54- 55- 56- 57-
Cooked	Breaded	☐					☐	☐	☐	58-
	Plain	☐					☐	☐	☐	59- 80-
Uncooked	Breaded	☐					☐	☐	☐	81- 82-
	Plain	☐					☐	☐	☐	83-

    IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 30

29b.

b. Why are you dissatisfied? _____ 64-

_____ ___ 65-

_____

30a. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or not with
the size of the portions in a package?
             Satisfied......   66-1
             Not satisfied..   - 2

    IF "SATISFIED," SKIP TO Q. 31

b. What size portion, in ounces, would you prefer?
                   _____ Oz. 67-

31a. What percentage of the portions that you serve are . . . .

fried?	____%	68-
broiled?	____	69-
baked?	____	70-
Other_____	____	71-
(specify)	100%	

b. Do you cook portions while still frozen?

Yes	72-1
No	-2

32. When you order portions from your supplier do you specify the kind of fish you want or not?

Specify kind.......	-4
Do not specify kind	-5

33 Are you currently buying more, less or about the same amount of portions compared to a year ago at this time?

Use more now	-7
About the same.....	-8
Use less now.......	-9
D.K	-0

34 Are there other portion controlled seafood items which are not now available but which you would like to have? (For example, such things as individual casseroles, portions packed with different kinds of sauces, etc.)

Yes	73-1
No	-2
D.K.	-3

IF "NO" OR "O.K.", SKIP TO Q. 36

35. What are they? _____ 74-

_____

_____

FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

CARD 2

38. What were all the different kinds of frozen processed fish that you bought in the month of November? I don't mean the portion controlled or pre-shaped fish we have just discussed.

None ——— 5-X	
SK	SKIP TO Q. 45

FOR EACH KIND ASK:

37. How were the_____ processed when you bought
(Species)
them? Were they steaks, fillets, precooked, breaded or what? (DESCRIBE THOROUGHLY)

38. Generally, are you satisfied with the amount of pre-preparation of the _____ ? Or would
(Species Form)
you prefer more or less?

FOR EACH DIFFERENT SPECIES/FORM ASK:

39. What package size did you buy?

40. How many packages did you buy during the month?

41. How many servings do you usually get from this size package?

42a Generally speaking, are you satisfied or not with the types and sizes of the frozen processed fish packages?

Satisfied......	30-1
Dissatisfied...	-2
D.K.	-3

IF "SATISFIED" OR "O.K.," SKIP TO Q. 43

b. In what ways are you dissatisfied? _____ 31-

_____

_____

43a Are you satisfied or not with the quality or condition of the frozen processed fish that you buy?

Satisfied......	32-1
Dissatisfied...	-2
D.K.	-3

IF "SATISFIED" OR "O.K.", SKIP TO Q. 44

b. Why are you dissatisfied? _____ 33-

_____

_____

44 What percentage of the frozen processed fish that you serve is . . . .

fried?	____ %	34-
broiled?	____	35-
baked?	____	36-
Other_____	____	37-
(Specify)	100%	

SKIP TO Q. 46 IN "NON PROFIT" ESTABLISHMENTS

45. Which is more profitable for you, frozen processed seafood or other high protein foods?

Frozen Processed Seafood	38-1
Other_____	
(Specify)	
D.K ——— -X	

ASK ALL

46. Over the past twelve months, about how much did you spend for frozen processed seafood?

$ _____	39-
	40-

SECTION C - NON-USERS

47a. Have you ever served any frozen processed seafood in this establishment?

Yes	41-1
No	-2
D.K.	-3

IF "NO" OR "O.K.," SKIP TO QUESTION 48

b. Why did you stop serving frozen processed seafood?_____ 42-

_____

(36) Species	(37) Form - i.e. How Processed					(38) Should Be Pre-Prepared			(39) Pkg. Size Lbs.	(40) No. of Pkgs.	(41) No. Servings Per Pkg	
	Cooked	Breaded	Fillets	Steaks	Other (Specify)	More	Less	As Is				5- 6- 7- 8- 9-
Codfish ☐												10- 11- 12-
Flounder ☐												13- 14-
Haddock ☐												15- 16- 17-
Halibut ☐												
Ocean Perch ☐												18- 19-
Salmon ☐												20-
Swordfish ☐												21- 22-
Fish Cakes or Balls Unspecified ☐												23- 24-
Other												25- 26-
Other												27- 28-
Other												29-
Other												
Other												

48. Is there any particular reason why you don't
    serve any frozen processed seafood? _____

    _____ 43-

    _____ 44-

SECTION D - CLASSIFICATION DATA

49a. Do you have any cold storage facilities which
     are used (or could be used) for keeping frozen
     processed seafood?

                                    Yes   45-1
                                    No   -2

    IF "NO," SKIP TO Q. 50

  b. About what is your capacity in cubic feet? 46-
                              Cu. Ft. _____47-

50a. Is there any particular type of food that you
     specialize in serving?
                         Specialty.......   48-1
                         No Specialty....   -2

    IF "NO SPECIALTY," SKIP TO Q. 51

  b. What is your specialty?
        Steak or Chop House   -4   Chinese Food   -7
        Seafood............   -5   Italian Food   -8
        French Food........   -6   Health Food   -9
                                   Kosher   -0
        Other _____
                              (Specify)

51. On how many days of the week are meals served
    here?
                              7 days.....   49-1
                              6 days.....   -2
                              5 days.....   -3
                              Less than 5   -4

52. What is your seating capacity?
                         # Seats _____ 50-
                                          51-

53a. About how many main, mid-day (lunch) meals do
     you serve each weekday, excluding Saturday
     and Sunday?   # _____ 52-
                                             53-

  b. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?
                                 # _____ 54-
                                             55-

  c. About how many main mid-day (lunch) meals do
     you serve on Saturdays and Sundays?
                                 # _____ 56-
                                             57-

  d. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?
                                 # _____ 58-
                                             59-

54a. About how many main evening (supper) meals
     do you serve each weekday, excluding Saturday
     and Sunday?   # _____ 60-
                                             61-

  b. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?
                                 # _____ 62-
                                             63-

  c. About how many main evening (supper) meals
     do you serve on Saturdays and Sundays?
                                 # _____ 64-
                                             65-

  d. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?
                                 # _____ 66-
                                             67-

55. How many regular employees do you usually have
    that are engaged in the preparation and serving
    of food?   # _____ 68-
                                             69-

56. In the last 12 months about how much did you
    spend for food? $ _____ 70-
                                            71-

57. About what percentage was this of your total
    operating cost?   _____ % 72-

    SHOW CARD 8
58. In which of these groups would you report your
    total receipts from meals served during 1957 or
    your last fiscal year?
                           Less than $10,000 _____ 73-1
    (IF FISCAL YEAR $10,000 to $40,000 _____   -2
    PLEASE SPECIFY) $40,000 to $100,000 _____   -3
    _____   Over $100,000 _____   -4

59. About what is the average price per meal for
    all the meals that you serve (excluding
    liquor)? $ _____ 74-
                                             75-

60. **TYPE OF FOOD SERVICE OPERATION**

    Class I   76-1

    Restaurant...........................   -5
    Cafeteria............................   -6
    Hotel................................   -7
    Motel................................   -8
    Drinking Place.......................   -9

    Other _____
                    (Specify)

    Class II   -2

    Public School _____   -5
                      (Specify Type)

    Private School _____   -6
                      (Specify Type)

    In Plant Feeding _____   -7
                      (Specify Type)

    Other_____
                    (Specify)

    Class III   -3

    Hospital _____   -5
                      (Specify Type)

    Home for Handicapped_____   -6
                      (Specify Type)

    Hostel _____   -7
                      (Specify Type)

    House of Correction _____   -8
                      (Specify Type)

    Other_____
                    (Specify)

    Class IV   -4

    Store _____   -5
                      (Specify Type)

    Lunch Counter, Stand....................... -6

    Club _____   -7
                      (Specify Type)

    Other_____
                    (Specify)

    Name of Person(s) Interviewed _____

    _____

    Title_____

    Name of Establishment_____

    Address_____

    City_____ State _____

    Telephone No._____C.F. # _____ 77-

    Interviewer_____Date_____

    Time Interview Started_____ AM   78-
                                       PM

    Time Interview Ended _____ AM   79-
                                       PM

    Validated By_____ 80-