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## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(Criseags

A. Use of Frozer Processed Sea Food (T'ables 1, 2;

Four fifths of all the establishments in Chicago said they bought sea food in the previous twelve montins. Among buyers of sea t'ood, a heavy majority said they made purchases of sea food in the frozen processed form.

Forty-six per cent of ali the establishments said they had bought frozen processed iish in November. 1958; 35 per cent said they had bought frozen processed shellfish; while 13 per cent said they had bought portions.

Amone institutions (such as schools and hospitals), the incidence of lise of frozen processed sea food was greater than among public eating places.

Of the ten cities in the survey, Chicago ranked fourtr, in terms of the percentage of all establishments buying frozen processed sea food.
B. Frozen Processed Fish - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

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

Almost two thirds of the users of frozen processed fish bought ocean perch fillets during November, 1958. This was the most popular of the frozen processed fish items
in Inicagc. Ocean perch fillet was alss the leading item, in terms of total pounds purchasea.

Halibut steaks were aiso bought in large quantities Dy many establishments in Chieago.

Ocean perch fillets were bought widely and in substantial quantities in the Southern and Middle Western cities included in the survey, while halibut steaks were popular purchases in Denver: Los Angeles, Omana, and Springfield.

A g-eater variety of species was bought by Cnicago establishments than by those of some other citues. Faddock fillets, and salmon steaks were bought in some quantity, and various 乞ther items were purchased by Chicage establishments. Twenty-two species were included in Chicago purchases.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation and Quality and Condition of Eish (Tables 5, 6)

A great majority of Chicago purchasers were satis ied with the present prepreparation of fish., and with the quality and condition of the fish.

This was generally true for the ten zities included in the survey.
3. Packaging of Pish (Tables ?, 8)

Chicago establishments most typically bought frozen processed fish in 5 pound packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Fish

Frying was the most popular method of preparing fish amons Chicago establishments. The average establishment served 69 per cent of its Eish fried.

Frying was the leading method in all ter cities of the study.
C. Prozen Proceased Shellifh - Purchases Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Bpecies and Type of Prepreparation (Tables 10, 11)

Among Chicago users of frozen processed ahell1ish, two thirds bought breaded shrimp in November, 1958. A fourth of the users bought raw shrimp. Large quantities were purchased of both items. Because of a large purchase by a major airline, crab meat was the leading item in terms of quantity for Chicago.

Breaded shrimp and raw shrimp were bought videly and in large quantities in all of the other cities included in the gtudy.
2. Attitudes Towand Prepreparation; Toward

Quality and Condition of Shelifish
Tables 12, 13)
All but a fow purchasers were satisfied with
the present preprepare on of shellfish, and wit the quality and condition of the shellfish wi=h they bought.

The same held generally true for the other cities in the survey.
3. Packaging of Shelifiah (Tables 24, 15)

Leading shellfish items were most often bought in 5 pound packages in Chicago.
4. Methode of Preparing and Serving Shellfish (Table 16)

Frying was the most popular way of preparing shelifish in Chicago. The typical establishwent served three quarters of its shellfish fried.

As with fish, frying ves the leading method of preparing ahelufioh in all ten cities of the study.
D. Portion Controlled Sea Pood - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Type of Prepreparation Tables 1, 17, 18, 19)

One eighth of all the establishments in Chicago bought portians during November, 1958.

Chicago ranked ninth among the ten cities, in percentage of eetablishments buying portions.

In Chicago partions were most often bought
uncooked-Dlain and uncooked-breaded.

Almost three fourths of the purchasers of portions said that they were currently buying about the same amount of portions as the year before. Pifteen per cent said they were buy* ing more, and 6 per cent said they were buying less.
2. Attitudes Toward Portions (Tables 20, 21 22, 23, 24)

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

About 10 per cent of the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was better than that of other frozen processed fish. Almost four fifths of the users rated the quality as about the same, while a small number considered the quality poorer.

Major advantages cited for portions included:

|  | $\%$ of <br> Users <br> Citing |
| :--- | ---: |
| Convenience, ease of preparation | 55 |
| Fast, timesaving | 46 |
| Size of portions, uniform portions | 28 |
| Economy, no waste | 27 |
| Can control food costs better - | 16 |
| know profit |  |

About one fourth of the users specified some disadvantage to using portions. A variety of disadvantages vas mentioned.

Users of portions gen ally thought their customers liked portions as well as other types fifrozen processed fiah. Fewer than 5 per cent said that their customers liked portions less than other types of frozen processed sea food.
3. Packaging of Portions (Table 25, 26)

Chicago purchasers tended to buy portions in somewhat larger packages than purchasers in other cities. The average weight of a package of portions for the city was 6.2 pounds.

Chicago establishments tended to buy individual portions of medium size. The average weight of an individual portion was 4.4 ounces.

The great majority of establishments, in Chicago and the other nine cities, said they were satisfied with the size of portions in the packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Portions (Tables 27, 28)

Frying was the most widely used method of preparing and serving portions in Chicago, with 89 per cent of establishments serving them this way. The average establishment served 77 per cent of its portions fried.

Frying was the leading method in nine of the ten cities of the study. The exception was Springfield, Massachusetts, where baking was the most popular method of preparation.

Almost three iffths of the Chicago establishments usins portions cooked them while frozen.
5. Cost of Usine Portions (Table 29)

Fewer than a tentin of the establishments using portions said they were more expensive than othe forms of frczen processed fish. A large majority of users considered them less expensive, or zatec them about the same.
6. Miscellaneous Findings About Portions Tables 30, 31)

Five sixths of the Chicage establishments said they specified the kind of fish when ordering portions.

Only 1 per cent of the users suggested any new portion items, not now available, which they would like to have.
7. Nonusers of Portions (Table 32)

Establishments which used frozen processed ses food, but not portions, gave \& number of reasons for not buying portions: they sold comparatively little fist, they served other types of fish, the size of the portions was not suitable.
E. Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food Tables 33, 34, 35, 36)

Establishments in Chicago 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 satiafied with the services of the suppliers.

Seá sood wholesalers suppl d 62 per cent of the establishme:*s, while frozen fova distributors accounted for another - $\quad$ rer cent.

Main suppliers were located less than 10 miles from the establishment, in 79 per cent of the cases.

In more than two thirds of the cases, deliveries were mode once a week.

Only a small number of purchasers said they could thini of ways in which the suppliers could improve their services.
F. Expenditures for Frozen Processed Sea Food;

Its Profitability (Tables 37, 38)
More than a third of the establishments reporting in Chicago said that they spent less than $\$ 250$ for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twelve months The highest figure reported fell between $\$ 30,000$ and $\$ 49,909$. Other establishments were between these two extremes, with the median coming at $\$ 457$.

Almost two thirds of the reporting, profit-making establishments which expressed an opinion, considered frozen processed sea food more profitable than other high protein foods.
G. Government Inspection of Frozen Processed Sea Food - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes
(Tables 39, 40, 41, 42)
Almost three quarters of the establishments in Chicago were aware that they could buy frozen processed sea food, which had been inspected or graded by the United States Government.

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

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, 1 per cent said the inspection had caused them to buy more.
H. Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food; Cold

Storage Facilities (Tables 43, 44, 45)
Most nonusers in Chicago said they had never bought frozen processed sea food, with the main reason given being that they sold little or no fish. The pattern was similar in other cities.

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

## Total Nonusers of Frozen

 Processed Sea Food
## Have cold storage facilities 71

Don't use sea food at all ..... 33
Use sea food, but not frozen processed sea food ..... 38

## DETAILED FINDINGS

## Table 1 <br> - <br> DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { others } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (842) | (615) | (51) | (50) | (126) | (272) | (291) | (152) | (127) |
|  | \& | q | 中 | 中 | q | q | ¢ | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought sea food | 79.6 | 79.2 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 65.9 | 67.3 | 80.1 | 90.8 | 91.3 |
| Bought frozen processed sea food | 58.6 | 58.0 | 82.4 | 78.0 | 43.7 | 41.2 | 57.7 | 76.3 | 76.4 |
| Bought frozen processed fish | 45.6 | 45.2 | 58.8 | 68.0 | 33.3 | 30.5 | 43.3 | 64.5 | 60.6 |
| Bought frozen processed shellfish | 34.9 | 35.8 | 45.1 | 26.0 | 30.2 | 19.1 | 34.0 | 47.4 | 55.9 |
| Bought portions | 12.8 | 8.9 | 49.0 | 20.0 | 14.3 | 5.1 | 11.0 | 23.0 | 21.3 |
| No, did not buy sea food | 20.4 | 20.8 | 2.0 | - | 34.1 | 32.7 | 19.9 | 9.2 | 8.7 |

Table 2

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

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare <br> Establishments | All <br> Others | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purcbasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | (670) | (487) | (50) | (50) | (83) | (183) | (233) | (138) | (116) |
|  | \& | \& | $\pm$ | ¢ | \$ | $\$$ | \& | $\underline{2}$ | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought Prozen processed sea food | 73.6 | 73.3 | 84.0 | 78.0 | 66.3 | 61.2 | 72.1 | 84.1 | 83.6 |
| No, did not buy frozen processed sea food | 26.4 | 26.7 | 16.0 | 22.0 | 33.7 | 38.8 | 27.9 | 15.9 | 16.4 |

Table 3

## FROZEN PROCESSED FISE BOUGET IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 40,000 \text { - }$ $99,999$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (384) | (320) | (64) | (83) | (126) | (98) | (77) |
|  | \$ | ¢ | \% | ¢ | \& | \$ | ¢ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Bupralo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steaks Rav | . 3 | . 3 | - | 1.2 | . 8 | - | - |
| $\frac{\text { Catfish }}{\text { Ray }}$ | . 3 | . 3 | - | 1.2 | - | - | - |
| Cod Breaded | . 8 | . 9 | - | - | - | 3.1 | - |
| Fillets | 4.7 | 2.5 | 15.6 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 6.1 | 10.4 |
| Steaks | . 8 | . 6 | 1.6 | 1.2 | . 8 | - | 1.3 |
| Breaded fillets | . 3 | - | 1.6 | 1.2 | - | - | , |
| Cakes | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.6 | - | - | 2.0 | 2.6 |
| Ray | 1.0 | . 6 | 3.1 | - | - | 3.1 | 1.3 |
| $\frac{\text { Fish Cakes }}{\text { Breaded }}$ | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.6 | - | . 8 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| $\frac{\text { Flounder }}{\text { Fillet }}$ | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.6 | - | . 8 | 1.0 | 2.6 |
| Fay | 1.0 | . 6 | - | - | - | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| $\frac{\text { Grouper }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | . 3 | . 3 | - | - | - | - | 2.3 |

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

Table 3
(Contd.)

FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE
(Continued)
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | q | \% | \% | \% | \& | \& | \% |
| Haddock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | - 3 | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.0 | - |
| Breaded | . 5 | . 6 | - | 1.2 | - | 1.0 | - |
| Fillets | 7.3 | 5.6 | 15.6 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 10.2 | 13.0 |
| Steaks | 1.8 | 2.3 | 4.7 | - | 3.2 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| Raw | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.6 | - | . 8 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| Halibut 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | . 5 | - 3 | 1.6 |  |  | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| Fillets | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.6 | . 8 | 6.1 | 3.9 |
| Steaks | 35.7 | 33.8 | 45.3 | 27.7 | 39.0 | 31.6 | 44.2 |
| Breaded fillets | . 3 | . 3 | - | 1.2 | - | - | - |
| Cooked steaks | . 3 | - | 1.6 | 1.2 | 8 |  | - |
| Whole center cuts | . 3 | . 3 | - | - | . 8 | 5.1 | 7.8 |
| Raw | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | - | . 8 | 5.1 | 7.8 |
| Lake Perch | 13 | 9 | 3.1 | - | 2.4 | - | 2.6 |
| Ocean Perch 4.10 .6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 4.4 63.8 | 5.0 61.3 | 76.6 | 69.6 | 61.9 | 61.2 | 63.6 |
| Steaks | . 3 | . 3 | - | $1 . ?$ | - | - | . |
| Cooked and brearied | . 3 | . 3 | - | - | . 8 | - | - |
| Cooked fillets | . 3 | - | 1.6 | 1.2 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Breaded fillets | 11.2 | 12.5 | 4.7 | 7.2 | 14.3 | 12.2 | 9.1 |
| Boned | . 5 | - | 3.1 | - | 1.6 | 3.1 | 2.6 |
| Raw | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 2.6 |

Table 3
(Contd.)

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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | ¢ | 中 | $\pm$ | $\underline{6}$ | $\underline{6}$ | $\pm$ | $\pm$ |
| Pike |  |  | 1.6 | 1.2 | . 8 | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| $\frac{\text { Pompano }}{\text { Raw }}$ | Pompano |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Red Snapper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steaks | $.5$ | - 3 | 1.6 | - | - | - | 1.3 |
| Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | . 3 | . 3 | - | - | - | - | 1.3 |
| Fillets | . 8 | . 6 | 1.6 | 1.2 | - | - | 2.6 |
| Steaks | 4.7 | 2.8 | 14.1 | 2.4 | . 8 | 9.2 | 7.8 |
| Breaded steaks | . 3 | . 3 | - | - | . 8 | - | - |
| Rew | 1.0 | .9 | 2.6 | - | - | 1.0 | 3.9 |
| Sole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 6.5 | 5.3 | 12.5 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 14.3 |
| Rzw | 1.3 | 1.6 | . | - | - | 1.C | 5.2 |
| Squid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hiam | . 3 | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.6 | - |

## Table 3 <br> (Contd.)

$\frac{\text { FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, } 1958 \text { - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE }}{\text { (COntinued) }}$
According to Type of Establisbment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { 8nd } \\ \text { Over } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | \& | q | q | $\underline{\$}$ | q | $\underline{\$}$ |  |
| Swordfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 3 | . 3 |  |  |  | 1.0 | - |
| Fillets | . 5 | . 3 | 1.6 |  | - | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| Steaks | 1.3 | . 9 | 3.1 | - | - | 2.0 | 3.9 |
| Raw | . 5 | . 6 | - | - | - | - | 2.6 |
| Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finlets | . 8 | . 9 | - | - | - |  | 3.9 |
| Rav | . 8 | . 9 | - | - | - | 1.0 | 2.6 |
| Tuna |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turbot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitefish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 3.6 | 2.2 | 10.9 | 1.2 | . 8 | 4.1 | 10.4 |
| Steaks | . 5 | . 6 |  | - | . 8 | 1.0 | - |
| Breaded steaks | - 3 | . 3 | - |  | . 8 | - |  |
| Raw | . 8 | . 9 | - | 1.2 | . 8 | - | $\cdot 2.6$ |
| Whiting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {Fillets }}$ | . 5 | . 6 | 1. | 1.2 | . 8 | - | - |

Table 4

QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBERR, 1958

|  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  | Haddock | Total Pounds | $\frac{\text { Average Num }}{\text { All }}$ Establishments | Of Pounds User Establishmenta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | All | User |  | Cooked | 40 | (a) | 40.0 |
|  |  | Establishments | Establishmenta | Breaded | 19 | (a) | 9.5 |
|  |  |  |  | Fillets | 6,622 | 7.9 | 236.5 |
| Bupfalo |  |  |  | Steaks | 945 | 1.1 | 135.0 |
| Steak | 10 | (a) | 10.0 | Raw | 85 | (b) | 21.3 |
| Raw | 80 | (b) | 40.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (a) | (b) |  | Hellbut |  |  |  |
| Catfish |  |  |  | Breaded | 30 | (a) | 15.0 |
| Raw |  |  |  | Fillets | 7,280 | 8.6 | 560.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Steaks | 13,755 | 16.3 | 100.4 |
| $\mathrm{Cod}_{\text {Breaded }}$ |  |  |  | Breaded fillets | 8 | (a) | 8.0 |
|  | 58 | (b) | 19.3 | Cooked steaks | 6 | (a) | 6.0 |
| Fillets | 2,336 | 2.8 | 129.8 | Whole center cuts | 30 | (a) | 30.0 |
| Steaka | - 41 | (a) | 13.5 | Raw | 1,352 | 1.6 | 112.7 |
| Breaded fillets | 25 | (a) | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Cakes | 165 | (b) | 41.2 | Lake Perch |  |  |  |
| Rew | 84 | (b) | 21.0 | Fillets | 143 | (b) | 28.5 |
| $\frac{\text { Fish Cakes }}{\text { Areaded }}$ | 185 | (b) | 46.2 | $\frac{\text { Ocean Perch }}{\text { Breaded }}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Breaded | 518 20,213 | 24.0 | 30.5 82.5 |
| Flounder | 13520 | $\begin{aligned} & (b) \\ & (a) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.7 \\ & 10.0 \end{aligned}$ | Steaks | 20, 12 | (a) | 12.0 |
| Fillets |  |  |  | Cooked and breaded | 10 | (a) | 10.0 |
| Raw |  |  |  | Cooked fillets | 2,236 | (a) | 6.0 52.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Boned | 2, 30 | (a) | 15.0 |
| $\frac{\text { Fillets }}{\text { Grouper }}$ | 50 | (b) | 20.0 | Raw | 1,324 | 1.6 | 147.1 |

(a) Purchasea were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.
(b) Less than half a pound.

Table 4
(Contd.)

QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958
(Continued)

|  | Total Pounds |  |  |  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { Average Number }}{\text { All }}$ | $\frac{\text { User }}{}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { User } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | Establishments | Establishments |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Swordfish |  |  |  |
| Pike |  |  |  | Cooked | 20 | (a) | 20.0 |
| Fillets | 643 | . 8 | 160.8 | Fillets | 320 | (b) | 160.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Steaks | 325 | (b) | 65.0 |
| Pompano |  |  |  | Raw | 250 | (b) | 125.0 |
| Raw | (a) | - | - | Trout |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Red Snapper |  |  |  | Fillets | 456 | (b) 5 | 152.0 61.0 |
| Fillets | 146 | (b) | 29.2 | Raw | 183 |  |  |
| Steaks | (a) | - | - | Tuna |  |  |  |
| Salmon |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Frozen canned }}{}$ | (a) | (a) | - |
| Breaded | 10 | (a) | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 375 | (b) | 125.0 | $\frac{\text { Turbot }}{\text { Raw }}$ | 40 | (a) | 40.0 |
| Steaks | 9,126 | 10.8 | 507.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded steaks | 10 | (a) | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Rav | 2,544 | 3.0 | 636.0 | Whitefish 1.058 |  |  |  |
| Sole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Steaks | 1,058 70 | (b) | 35.0 |
| Fillets | 1,513 | 1.8 | 60.5 85.0 | Breaded steaks | 10168 | (b) | 56.0 |
| Raw | 425 | . 5 | 85.0 | Raw |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Squid }}{\text { Raw }}$ | 5 | (a) | 5.0 | Whiting $_{\text {Fillets }} 50$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (b) } \\ & \text { (b) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.0 \\ & 27.5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Fillets Raw | 50 55 |  |  |

(a) Purchases were not reported in quantities large enough to campute meaningful figures.
(b) Less than half a pound.

Table 5

SATISPACTION OR DISSATISPACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OP FROUKN PROCESSED PISH

|  | Total Users (1) |  | Total Users (1) $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pm$ |  | q |
| Total Purchasea of Cod | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Salmon | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| Prefer more prepreparation of cod | - | Prefer more prepreparstion of salmon |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of cod | - | Prefer less prepreparation of selmon |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 90.9 |  |  |
| Fo answer | 9.1 | No answer | 85.2 14.8 |
| Total Purchases of Haddock | $\underline{100.0}$ | Total Purchases of Sole | 100.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparstion of haddock |  | Prefer more prepreparation of sole |  |
| Prefer leas prepreparstion of haddock | 2.4 | Prefer less prepreparstion of sole |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it 1 s | 85.7 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 96.7 |
| No answer | 11.9 | No answer | 3.3 |
| Total Purchases of Hallibut | $\underline{100.0}$ | Total Purchases of Whitefish | 100.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of hallibut |  | Prefer more prepreparation of whitefish |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of halibut |  | Prefer less prepreparation of whitefiah | 5.0 |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 89.2 | Frefer prepreparstion as it is | 90.0 |
| No anawer |  | Ho answer | 5.0 |
| Total Purchases of Ocean Perch | 100.0 |  |  |
| Prefer more prepreparation of ocean perch | - 3 |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of ocean perch | . 3 |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is Mo ansver | 93.1 |  |  |
| Ro answer | 6.3 |  |  |

Prefer prepreparation as it is
No answer

## Table 6

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATIGFACTION

WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION
OF FROZEN FROCESSED FISH

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish, November, 1958 | (304) |
|  | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 |
| Satisfied | 96.1 |
| Dissstisfied | 1.8 |
| No answer | 2.1 |

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

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

Because purchases of many species were few 1 n number, the species are not included in the table.

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


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

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

The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one species of fish, preprepared in one manner.

PACKAGES SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NMMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1)

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

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

The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one species of fish, preprepared in one manner.

## Table 8

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN
FROCESSED FISH PACKAGES

Total
Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish, November, 1958 (384)

Satisfled
Dissatisffed
3.1

Don't know
$\cdot 3$

No answer
2.1

Table 9

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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 20,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fisb | （384） | （320） | （64） | （83） | （126） | （98） | （77） |
|  | q | ¢ | 中 | 中 | 中 | \＆ | \＆ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nove fried | 9.6 | 7.5 | 20.3 | 13.3 | 3.2 | 6.1 | 20.8 |
| 1－14\％ | 1.0 | ． 6 | 3.1 | － | 1.6 | － | 2.6 |
| 15－34\％ | 5.2 | 5.6 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 13.0 |
| 35－64\％ | 19.5 | 18.1 | 26.6 | 10.8 | 16.7 | 26.5 | 24.7 |
| 65－84\％ | 4.7 | 3.1 | 12.5 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 7.2 | 9.1 |
| Over 84\％ | 57.7 | 62.9 | 31.3 | 67.5 | 72.1 | 52.1 | 29.8 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | － |
| Average percentage served | 69.4 | 72.4 | 54.1 | 73.4 | 78.8 | 69.5 | 50.0 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nane broiled | 72.7 | 74.0 | 65.7 | 79.6 | 85.7 | 67.4 | 50.6 |
| 1－14\％ | 1.3 | ． 6 | 4.7 | 1.2 | ． 8 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| 15－34\％ | 3.9 | 2.5 | 10.9 | 2.4 | ． 8 | 5.1 | 9.1 |
| 35－64\％ | 12.2 | 11.6 | 15.6 | 8.4 | 7.1 | 17.4 | 18.2 |
| 65－84\％ | 2.1 | 2.5 | － | － | ． 8 | 2.0 | 6.5 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 5.5 | 6.6 | － | 3.6 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 14.3 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refuse＇i | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | － |
| Average percentage served | 14.1 | 14.6 | 11.1 | 8.6 | 6.7 | 15.6 | 29.4 |

Table 9
（Contd．）

PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH SERVED FRIED，BROLIED，BAKED，AND IN OTHER WAYS
（Continued）
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | （384） | （320） | （64） | （83） | （126） | （98） | （77） |
|  | \＆ | 中 | 中 | 中 | \＆ | 中 | \＆ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 76.6 | 81.2 | 53.1 | 80.8 | 80.9 | 75.6 | 66.2 |
| 1－14\％ | 1.6 | 1.3 | 3.1 | － | ． 8 | 1.0 | 5.2 |
| 15－34\％ | 4.7 | 1.4 | 6.3 | － | 3.2 | 9.2 | 6.5 |
| 35－64\％ | 9.6 | 8.1 | 17.2 | 4.8 | 8.7 | 12.2 | 13.0 |
| 65－84\％ | 1.3 | ． 9 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 1.6 | － | 2.6 |
| Over 84\％ | 3.9 | 1.9 | 14.1 | 8.4 | 2.4 | － | 6.5 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | － |
| Average percentage served | 10.9 | 7.8 | 26.4 | 21.6 | 8.8 | 8.6 | 16.4 |
| Establishments Serving in Other Ways 06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 96.0 | 96.6 | 93.7 | 95.2 | 97.6 | 95.0 | 96.1 |
| 1－14\％ | ． 3 | － | 1.6 | － | － | － | 1.3 |
| 15－34\％ | － 3 | － 3 | 6 | － | － | 2， | 1.3 |
| 35－64\％ | ． 5 | － 3 | 1.6 | － | － | 2.0 | － |
| 65－84\％ | ． 3 | － 3 | － | － | － | － | 1.3 |
| Over 84\％ | ． 3 | － 3 | － | 4.8 | 2． | 1.0 | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refuser． | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | － |
| Average percentage se：＂ved | ． 8 | 8 | ． 9 | － | － | 2.0 | 1.6 |

## FROZEN FROCESSED SHZLIFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 -. HOW PROCESSED BETORE PURCHASE

According to Type of Eatabliahment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of | tabliahment |  | Salea | lure |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000 \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Uaers of Frozen Proceased Shellfish | (294) | (258) | (36) | (52) | (99) | (72) | (71) |
|  | \& | \% | \& | \& | $\underline{8}$ | \& |  |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Clams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canned | . 3 | . 4 | - | 1.9 | - | - | - |
| Raw; clean | 1.0 | - | 8.3 | - | - | 1.4 | 2.8 |
| Crabs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 7 | . 8 | - | - | - | 2.8 | - |
| Crab lega | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Deviled and stuffed | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | 1.4 | - |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | 1.4 | 1.6 | - | - | - | - | 5.6 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 1.7 | 1.6 | 2.8 | - | - | 2.8 | 4.2 |
| Lobater |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 1.0 | . 8 | 2.8 | - | - | 1.4 | 2.8 |
| Cooked lobater meat | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Block frozen lobster meat | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | 7.8 | 8.1 | 5.6 | 1.9 | 7.1 | 5.6 | 15.5 |
| Rav; whole, clean | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.6 | - | 3.0 | 5.6 | 8.5 |
| Oyaters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 2.0 | 2.3 | - | 1.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 | - |
| Canned | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean | 3.1 | 1.6 | 13.9 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 5.6 |
| Scallopa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Breaded | 5.1 | 4.3 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 8.3 | 9.9 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 8.5 | 7.8 | 13.9 | - | 6.1 | 9.7 | 16.9 |
| Shrimp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 2.4 | 1.6 | 8.3 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 4.2 |
| Breaded | 67.7 | 70.5 | 47.2 | 71.2 | 78.8 | 59.7 | 57.7 |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.4 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Debeaded, raw in shell | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | 1.0 | - | - |
| Breaded steak | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | 1.4 | - |
| Stuffed with crab meat | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | 1.4 | - |
| Raw; clean, deheaded, shelled and deveined | 24.1 | 22.9 | $33 \cdot 3$ | 21.2 | 18.2 | 3.1 | 28.2 |

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

QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { User } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ |
| Clams |  |  |  |
| Canned | (a) 260 | (b) | 86.6 |
| Raw; clean |  |  |  |
| Crabs 60.0 |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 100 | (b) | 100.0 |
| Crab legs Deviled and stuffed | 24 | (a) | 24.0 |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned (c) | 51,733 | 61.4 | 12,933.2 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 764 | . 9 |  |
| Lobster 60.0 |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 180 | (b) | 1,000.0 |
| Cooked lobster meat | 1,000 200 | (b) | 1,000.0 |
| Block frozen lobster meat | 6,189 | 7.4 | 269.1 |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails Raw; whole, clean | 6,189 | 2.8 | 181.0 |
| Oysters 15.7 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | (a) ${ }^{94}$ | (b) | 15.7 |
| Canned | 285 | (b) | 31.7 |
| Scallops (b) 200.0 |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 200 | (b) | 42.3 |
| Breaded | 635 | 27.5 | 42.3 32.1 |
| Raw; clean, shelled |  | 27.5 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Shrimp } & 3,698 & 385.4\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 2,698 11,781 | 14.0 | 59.2 |
| Breaded Cooked and breaded | 11, 117 | (b) | 29.2 |
| Dooked and breaded | 30 | (a) | 30.0 |
| Breaded steak | 8 | (8) | 8.0 |
| Stuffed with crab meat | 150 | (b) | 150.0 |
| Raw: clean, deheaded, shelled aisd deveined | 7,185 | 8.5 | 101.2 |

(a) Purchases were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.
(b) Less than half a pound.
(c) Consists mostly of one large purchase by an airl_i.e.

## Table 12

## SATIBPACTION CR DESSATISPACTIOA YITH PRRPRBPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSRD BEELJPISA

|  | Total <br> Users <br> (1) |  | Total Users (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$$ |  | $\underline{ }$ |
| Total Purchases of Loboter | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Shrimp | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| reparstion of lobster | - | Prefer more prepreparstion of shrimp |  |
| reparation of lobster |  | Prefer lese prepreparation of shrimp | 1.4 |
| ation as it is | 85.4 | preper prepreparation as it is | 94.4 |
|  | 14.6 | No answer | 4.2 |

## Total Purchases of Scallopa 100.0

Prefer more prepreparation of scallops Prefer less prepreparstion of scallops Prefer prepreparation as it 10 No answer
otal

## Table 13

BATISPACTIOX AND DIBEATISPACTIOS
WITH QUAL TITY AND CONDITION OP
PROZEN PROCESSED BHELLFISR

## Tot al

Total Users of Frozen Frocesaed
Shellpish, November, 1958

## (294)

## $\pm$

Dissatisfled ..... 3.1
No answer ..... 2.7

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

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \& |  | \% |
| Total Purchasers of Lobster Tails - Cleaned and Deheaded | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Breaded | 100.0 |
| Packages less than 1 pound | 4.4 | Packages leas than 1 pound 1 pound packages | .5 1.0 |
| 1 pound packages | 17.3 | 2 pound packages | 9.6 |
| 5 pound packages | 17.3 | 3 pound packages | 21.1 |
| 10 pound packages | 21.8 | 4 pound packages | 21.1 |
| 20 pound packages | 17.3 | 5 pound packagea | 41.2 |
| 25 pound packages | 13.1 | 6 pound packages | 1.0 |
| 50 pound packages and over | 4.4 | 8 pound packages | . 5 |
| No answer | 4.4 | 10 pound packages | 2.5 |
|  |  | 30 pound packages | . 5 |
| Average number of servings per pound | 1.7 | No answer | 1.0 |
|  |  | Average number of servings per pound | 3.3 |
| Total Purchasers of $\qquad$ Scallops - Raw | 100.0 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Furchasers of Shrimp - Raw | 100.0 |
| 1 pound packages | 4.0 |  |  |
| 2 pound packages | 4.0 | 2 pound packages | 5.6 |
| 3 pound packages | 4.0 | 3 pound packages | 5.6 |
| 4 pound packages | 4.0 | 5 pround packages | 74.7 |
| 5 pound packages | 68.0 | 7 pound packages | 1.4 |
| 10 pound packages | 4.0 | 10 pound packages | 7.1 |
| 30 pound packages | 4.0 | 20 pound packages | 1.4 |
| 50 pound packages and over | 4.0 | 25 pound packages | 1.4 |
| No enswer | 4.0 | 30 pound packages | 1.4 |
|  |  | 50 pound packages and over | 1.4 |
| Average number of servings per pound | 4.1 | Average number of servings per pound |  |
|  |  |  | 4.4 |

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

WITH TYPES AND SITES OF FROZEN
PROCESSED SHELLFISH PACKAGES

Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Breaded

Packages leas than 1 pound
pouñ packages
pound package
pound package
5 pound package
8 pound packaces
10 pound packages
30 pound packages
No answer

Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw
(1) The table shows figures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur most often in the city.

Sometimes figures are shown for package sizes but not average number of servings per pound. In these cascs the data on servings per pound is limited
The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one species of shellfish, preprepared in one manner.

## Table 16

FERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHETLFISH SERVED FRIED, BROTIED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS
According to Type of Bstablishment and Sales Volume

| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | $\underline{\text { Institutions }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | (258) | (36) | (52) | (99) | (72) | (71) |
|  | \& | \& | 2 | q | ¢ | \& |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried  6.9 6.2 36.2  <br> N      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-14\% | 1.0 | 1.2 | 36. | - | - |  | 4.2 |
| 15-34\% | 2.0 | 2.3 | - | - | 1.0 | 2.8 | 4.2 |
| 35-64\% | 7.5 | 7.4 | 8. 3 | 1.9 | 6.1 | 11.1 | 9.9 |
| 65-84\% | 4.4 | 3.9 | 8.3 |  | 4.0 | 5.6 | 7.0 |
| Over 84\% | 71.1 | 75.5 | 38.9 | 82.7 | 76.8 | 73.6 | 52.2 2.8 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.1 | 3.5 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Average percentage served | 76.1 | 79.5 | 50.3 | 83.4 | 80.1 | 80.3 | 61.1 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled 76.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | . 3 | - | 2.8 |  | - | - | 1.4 |
| 15-34\% | 1.7 | 1.6 | 2.8 | - | - | - | 7.1 |
| 35-64\% | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.6 | - | 5.1 | 6.9 | 4.2 |
| 65-84\% | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.8 | - | 1.0 | , | 4.2 |
| Over 84\% | 2.0 | 2.3 | - | 7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 4.2 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.1 | 3.5 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Average percentage served | 5.8 | 5.7 | 6.2 | - | 5.3 | 4.9 | 11.3 |

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

Table 16
(Contd.)

## PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS <br> (Continued)

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | (294) | (258) | (36) | (52) | (99) | (72) | (71) |
|  | ¢ | \% | \& | $\underline{8}$ | ¢ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-14\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15-34\% | . 7 | . 4 | 2.8 | - | - | - | 2.8 |
| 35-64\% | 1.0 | . 8 | 2.8 | - | - | - | 4.2 |
| 65-84\% | . 3 | . 4 | - | - | 1.1 | - | - 4 |
| Over 84\% | . 3 | . 4 | - | -7 | - | . | 1.4 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.1 | $3 \cdot 5$ | 8.3 | 7.7 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Average percentage served | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.2 | - | . 8 | - | 4.2 |
| Establishments Serving in Other Ways 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 75.8 | 80.2 | 44.5 | 82.7 | 80.8 | 77.8 | 62.0 |
| 1-14\% | 3.1 | 2.3 | 8.3 | - | 3.0 | 1.4 | 7.0 |
| 15-34\% | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.6 | - | 6.1 | 8.2 | 7.0 |
| 35-64\% | 4.1 | 4.7 | - | 1.9 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 8.5 |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | 7 | - | 4.2 | 12.7 |
| Over 84\% | 7.1 | 3.5 | 33.3 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 12.7 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused. | 4.1 | 3.5 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Average percentage served | 10.7 | 7.4 | 35.6 | 8.7 | 7.1 | 9.0 | 18.6 |

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

TYPES OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958
According to Type of Establishrent and Sales Volune

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 40,000 \end{aligned}$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) | (73) | (35) | (46) | (62) |
|  | \& | \& | \& | \& |  |
|  | $\underline{100.0 *}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Cooked - breaded | 17.5 | 16.4 | 20.0 | 15.2 | 19.3 |
| Cooked - plain | 1.0 | 1.3 | - | - | 1.6 |
| Uncooked - breaded | 48.1 | 49.3 | 45.7 | 41.3 | 53.3 |
| Uncooked - plain | 41.7 | 41.1 | 42.9 | 45.7 | 38.7 |

Table 18

QUANTITY OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All | User Establ 1shments |
| Cooked - breaded | 1,526 | 1.8 | 80.3 |
| Cooked - plain | 48 | (b) | 48.0 |
| Uncooked - breaded | 4,690 | 5.6 | 90.2 |
| Uncooked - plain | 7,637 | 9.1 | 169.7 |

(b) Less than half a pound.
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 19

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Than <br> $\$ 40,000$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) | (73) | (35) | (46) | (62) |
|  | \$ | \& | \& | 中 | \$ |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Use more now | 14.8 | 15.1 | 14.3 | 17.4 | 12.9 |
| Use about the same | 71.3 | 72.6 | 68.6 | 63.1 | 77.5 |
| Use less now | 5.6 | 2.7 | 11.4 | 6.5 | 4.8 |
| Don't know | 8.3 | 9.6 | 5.7 | 13.0 | 4.8 |

Table 20

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH <br> QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS

QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORT

Total Purcbases of Types of
Portions, November, 1958
Total

8atisfied
Dissatisfied

Don't know

Note: Figures are bssed on total purcbases of types of portions. Some establishments bought more than one type.

Table 21

IS THE QUALITY OF PORTIONS BETTER THAN THAT OF OTHER FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?
Tots 1
Total Users of Portions ..... (108)\&100.0
Say portions better

Quality

$$
\frac{10.2^{*}}{5.6}
$$

Uniform controlled serving - always same amount

$$
.9
$$

Customers order, seem to like them - more demand
Attractive - eye sppealingAttractive - eye eppealing9
9Don't know - no snswer
Portions poorer ..... 1.9
whit is in them ..... 1.9
About the same ..... 78.7
Don't know ..... 8.3
No answer
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 22

## ADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions, November, 1958 | (108) |
|  | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0* |
| Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor, already prepared | 54.6 |
| Fast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare | 46.3 |
| Size of portions - uniform, controlled servings, the right size serving | 27.8 |
| Economical - no waste | 26.9 |
| Can control food cost better - know profit | 15.7 |
| Attractive, eye appealing | 4.6 |
| Customers like them | 4.6 |
| Taste better | 2.8 |
| No spoilage | 1.9 |
| No bones | . 9 |
| Sanitary - cleaner, safer | . 9 |
| No advantages | 1.9 |
| Don't know, no answer | 1.9 |

Table 23

## dISADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

Total
Total Users of Portions
(108)q
100.0*
Portions wrong size - too small ..... 4.6
Not economical - more expensive to buy ..... 2.8
Quality not as good - not always sure what's in them ..... 1.9
Not encugh demand - customers do not order ..... 1.9
Lack flavor - not as tasty, sometimes dry .....  9
Break too easily ..... 9
All others ..... 2.8
No disadvantages ..... 75.9
Don't know, no answer ..... 11.1
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## Table 24

DO ESTABLISEMENTS THINK CUSTOMERS FREFER PORTIONS TO OTHER

## FROZEN PROCESSED FISE - FOR WGAT RBASONS?

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) |
|  | \% |
|  | 100.0 |
| Think customers like portions better | 24.2* |
| Uniform controlled servings - always the same amount | 12.0 |
| Attractive - eye appealing | 9.3 |
| Taste better - like Plavor | 2.8 |
| Customers order - seem to like them | 1.9 |
| No bones - safer for chilaren | . 9 |
| Don't know - no answer | 3.7 |
| Think customers like portions lese | 4.6* |
| Lack flavor - not an tasty | 1.9 |
| Look artificial - not real | 1.9 |
| Portions too emall | . 9 |
| Poor quality - can't tell what is in them | . 9 |
| Think customers like portions about the same | 58.3 |
| Don't know | 13.0 |

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

## Table 25

## average weight of portions and average namber

## OF SERVINGS PER PACKAGE

| Total users of portions, November, 1958 | 108 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Average weight of package of portions, in pounds | 6.2 |
| Average number of servings per package | 26.2 |
| Average weight of individual servings, in ounces | 3.8 |
| Average weight of individual portions, in ounces | 4.4 |

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

Table 26

## SATISFACTION WITH THE SIZE OF

PORTIONS IN A PACKAGETotal Users of Portions(108)\&
Satisfied100.0
Dissatisfied ..... 5.6
Don't know, no answer ..... 3.7

Table 27

PERCENTAGE OF PORTIONS SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$40,000 | Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) | (73) | (35) | (46) | (62) |
|  | 中 | 中 | $\underline{6}$ | ¢ | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  |  |  |  |  |
| None fried | 11.1 | 8.2 | 17.1 | 10.9 | 11.3 |
| 1. $14 \%$ | . 9 | 1.4 | - | . | 1.6 |
| 15-34\% | 1.8 | 2.7 | - | - | 3.2 |
| 35-64\% | 5.6 | 2.7 | 11.4 | 2.2 | 8.1 |
| 65-84\% | 2.8 | - | 8.6 | - | 4.8 |
| Over 84\% | 77.8 | 85.0 | 62.9 | 86.9 | 71.0 |
| Average percentage served | $77 \cdot 3$ | 80.7 | 70.2 | 81.5 | 74.2 |
| Establishrents Serving Broiled |  |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 86.1 | 87.7 | 82.9 | 93.5 | 80.7 |
| 1-14\% | 2.8 | 1.4 | 5.7 | - | 4.8 |
| 15-34\% | 2.8 | 1.4 | 5.7 | 2.2 | 3.2 |
| 35-64\% | 1.8 | 2.7 | - | - | 3.2 |
| 65-84\% | . 9 | 1.4 | - | - | 1.6 |
| Over 84\% | 5.6 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 6.5 |
| Average percentage served | 7.6 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 9.9 |

Table 27
(Contd.)
$\frac{\text { PERCENTAGE OF PORTIONS SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS }}{\text { (Continued) }}$
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establ 1 shment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$40,000 | Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) | (73) | (35) | (46) | (62) |
|  | ¢ | q | \& | 中 | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 88.0 | 95.8 | 71.4 | 91.3 | 85.5 |
| 1-14\% | 1.8 | - | 5.7 | 2.2 | 1.6 |
| 15-34\% | 1.8 | 1.4 | 2.9 | - | 3.2 |
| 35-64\% | 3.7 | 1.4 | 8.6 | - | 6.5 |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | $6^{-}$ | - |
| Over 84\% | 4.7 | 1.4 | 11.4 | 6.5 | 3.2 |
| Average percentage served | 6.7 | 2.3 | 15.9 | 6.2 | 7.1 |
| Establishments Serving in Other Ways 06.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 98.2 | 97.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.8 |
| 1-14\% | . 9 | 1.4 | - | - | 1.6 |
| 15-34\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 35-64\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| Over 84\% | . 9 | 1.4 | - | - | 1.6 |
| Average percentage served | -9 | 1.4 | - | - | 1.6 |

## Table 28

DO ESTABLISEMENTS COOK PORTIONS WHILE STIZL FROZEN?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total |  |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type of Establishment Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | and |
|  |  | places | Institutions | $\$ 40,000$ |  |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) | (73) | (35) | (46) | (62) |
|  | 中 | \% | 中 | q | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, cook while Prozen | 59.2 | 60.3 | 57.1 | 69.6 | 51.6 |
| No, do not cook while frozen | 38.0 | 35.6 | 42.9 | 28.2 | 45.2 |
| No answer | 2.8 | 4.1 | - | 2.2 | 3.2 |

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

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

Total
Total Users of Portions (108)
$\underline{2}$
100.0

| Say portions more expensive | 9.3* |
| :--- | ---: |
| Price includes processing and packaging - preprepa- |  |
| ration would tend to raise cost |  |
| Good quality - choice fish | 7.4 |
| Cost is more for amount of serving | 1.8 |
| Portions less expensive | .9 |
| Less or no waste | $47.2^{*}$ |
| Labor saving - requires no preparation | 16.7 |
| Time saving | 15.7 |
| Uniform controlled servings | 13.9 |
| Cuts cost of preparation | 4.6 |
| No spoilage - can keep in freezer, can keep until | 2.8 |
| ready to use | 2.8 |
| Can control food costs better - know your profit | 1.8 |
| All others | 2.8 |
| Don't know - no answer | 10.2 |
| About the same | 38.0 |
| Don't know |  |

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

Table 30

WHEN ODERING PORTIONS FROM SUPPLIERS, DO ESTABLISEMENTS SFECIFY THB KIND OF FISH?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Totel | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$40,000 | Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (108) | (73) | (35) | (46) | (62) |
|  | q | \$ | \& | $\pm$ | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Specify kind of fish | 83.3 | 79.5 | 91.4 | 78.3 | 87.1 |
| Do not specify kind of fish | 14.8 | 17.8 | 8.6 | 17.4 | 12.9 |
| No answer | 1.9 | 2.7 | - | 4.3 | - |

## Table 31

WOUL THE ESTABLISHMENTS LIKE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION CONTROLLED SEA FOC ITEMS NOT NOW AVAILABLE？ According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | Total | Trpe of Establishment Purlic |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Purlic Eating Places | Institutions |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | （493） | （412） | （81） | （280） | （213） |
|  | 中 | 中 | $\pm$ | \＆ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 170.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes，would like other items | 1.4 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| No，would not like other items | 92.7 | 91.5 | 92.6 | 9 C .3 | 93.4 |
| Don＇t know | 3.0 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 2.3 |
| No answer | 3.9 | 4.1 | 2.5 | 4.3 | $3 \cdot 3$ |

## Table 32

Total Establishments Using Frozen Processed
Sea Food, but Not Portions

Serve other types - perch, shrimp, halibut, etc., other
types more popular
Size of portions - prefer to cut own portions, want larger portions, get more with other kinds
Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh fish, cheaper to
prepare ourselves
Quality not as good - doesn't meet our quality standards, can't tell what is is it
Prefer to prepare own - rather bread my own, do not like way it must be cooked, prefer own methods
Use fresh fisin - prefer fresh fish
Don't like them so wouldn't serve them
Dislike flavor - fresh fish has more flavor, no taste
to portion controlled sea foods
No particular reason - just didn' -
Didn't know it was avallable
Company makes the rules - policy against it
Just opened the restaurant - don't know what we will handle
1.3

Not attractive - not eye appealing
1.3

Wanted to change menu - try something different
1.3
.8

All others
3.9

Don't know, no answer.

## Total

## q

## WAS PRICE A REASON ESTABLISHMENTS <br> DID NOT BUY PORTIONS?

## 100.0*

34.3
14.5
13.8
5.7
4.9
1.6

Notal Nusers Who Did Not Volunteer
Price as a Reason

Yes, price was a reason
No, price was not a reason

No answer

## *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 ESTABLISEMENTS
According to Sales Volume

|  | Less <br> Than <br> Total Users of Frozen <br> Processed Sea Food | (40tal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

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


## Table 34

DISTANCE OF ESTABLISEMENT FROM MAIN SUPPLIER OF FRCZEN PROCESSED SEA FOON
According to Location

|  | Total | Out of Central Business District | $\begin{gathered} \text { In } \\ \text { Central } \\ \text { Business } \\ \text { District } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (493) | (449) | (44) |
|  | \$ | $\pm$ |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 10 miles | 78.5 | 77.3 | 90.9 |
| 10-50 miles | 19.1 | 20.5 | 4.5 |
| $51-100$ miles | - | - | - |
| More than 100 miles | . 2 | - | 2.3 |
| Don't know | 1.0 | 1.1 | - |
| No answer | 1.2 | 1.1 | 2.3 |

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (493) | (412) | (81) | (112) | (168) | (116) | (97) |
|  | \& | $\pm$ | q | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | \& | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Every day | 5.7 | 6.6 | 1.2 | . 9 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 14.4 |
| 2-4 times per week | 11.0 | 12.9 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 7.7 | 11.2 | 23.7 |
| Once a week | 68.6 | 68.9 | 66.7 | 66.1 | 74.4 | 74.1 | 54.7 |
| 2-3 times per month | 6.5 | 5.8 | 9.9 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 3.5 | 4.1 |
| Once a month | 3.4 | 1.9 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| Less than once a month | 1.4 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| Don't know, no answer | 3.4 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 10.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | - |

## Table 36

CAN SUPPLIERS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IMPROVE SERVICES TO ESTABLISHMENTS?
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Then $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000 \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (493) | (112) | (168) | (116) | (97) |
|  | \& | \% | \& | \& | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can 1mprove services | 3.4 | 1.8 | 4.8 | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| No, cannot improve services | 93.3 | 92.8 | 92.2 | 93.9 | 94.8 |
| Don't know | . 3 | 2.7 | 3.0 | . 9 | 2.1 |
| No answer | 1.0 | 2.7 | - | 1.7 | - |

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

According to Thpe of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & \hline 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | and <br> Over |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (493) | (412) | (81) | (112) | (168) | (116) | (97) |
|  | 4 | $\underline{8}$ | \& | q | \& | q |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$250 | 35.8 | 39.3 | 12.8 | 75.0 | 39.5 | 16.8 | 13.5 |
| \$250-499 | 17.0 | 17.4 | 14.9 | 16.7 | 27.1 | 11.6 | 5.9 13.5 |
| \$500-999 | 20.6 | 19.7 | 27.7 | 6.9 1.4 | 23.3 8.5 | 27.4 | 29.8 |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 16.0 | 13.9 | 29.7 |  |  |  |  |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 2.1 | - | . 8 | 6.3 | 13.5 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 6.4 | - | . 8 | 4.2 1.1 | 13.5 5.9 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 1.4 | . 9 | 4.3 | - | - | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | . 3 | - 3 | - | - | - |  |  |
| \$30,000-49,999 | . 6 | . 3 | 2.1 | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| \$100,000 and over | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |

Table 38

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

According to Sales Volume and Type of Establishment

| tal Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | (412) | (81) | (112) | (168) | (116) | (97) |
|  | ¢ | \& | \& | \& | 中 | \& | q |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Say sea food more profitable than other high protein foods | 43.0 | $47 \cdot 3$ | 21.0 | 29.5 | 43.4 | 50.0 | 49.5 |
| Say meat (unspecifled) more profitable than sea food | 8.9 | 10.4 | 1.2 | 13.4 | 11.9 | 3.4 | 5.2 |
| Say all foods the same in profitability | 8.9 | 10.2 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 9.5 | 12.9 | 8.2 |
| Say beef more profitable than sea food | 4.1 | 4.9 | - | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 5.2 |
| Say eggs more profitable than sea food | 1.0 | 1.2 | - | . 9 | . 6 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| Say chicken more profitable than sea food | . 2 | . 2 | - | - | - | . 9 | - |
| Say miscellaneous other meats more profitable than sea food | . 2 | . 2 | - | - | . 6 | - | - |
| Say miscellaneous other foods more profitable than sea food | 2.4 | 2.9 | - | 1.8 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.1 |
| Nonprofit establishments | 11.6 | - | 70.4 | 12.5 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 14.4 |
| Don't know | 17.2 | 19.9 | 3.7 | 26.8 | 15.5 | 12.9 | 14.4 |
| No answer | 4.1 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 7.1 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.1 |

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

Table 39

D THE ESTABLISHMETTS KNOW THEY CAN BUY COVERMMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD? According to Type of Establishment

|  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places <br> Total Users of Frozen <br> Processec Sea Food | (493) | (412) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 41

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

|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchasers of Government Inspected or Graded Sea Food | (356) | (291) | (65) |
|  | q | \& | q |
|  | $\underline{100.0 * *}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Best quality - use better products, more uniform quality | 42:1 | 43.3 | 36.9 |
| Only type available - it's all inspected, that's what supplier carried | 31.2 | 30.9 | 32.3 |
| Government inspected foods are safe - pure, fresh, clean, no germs or disease | 27.5 | 26.5 | 32.3 |
| Prefer Government inspected - wouldn't buy any other | 2.5 | 2.1 | 4.6 |
| Public demands it | 1.7 | 2.1 | - |
| Easy to handle - easy to serve, ready to cook, partion controlled | 1.4 | - 3 | 6.2 |
| Government/law requires it | . 8 | 1.0 | - |
| Company demands that it's bought | . 6 | . 7 | - |
| All others | - 3 | - | 1.5 |
| Don't know, no answer | 4.5 | 4.8 | 3.1 |

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

## Table 42

## HAS GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AFFECTED THE AMOUNT OF FROZEN

PROCESSED SEA FOOD BOUGHT BY THE ESTABLISHMENT?
According to Type of Establishment

| Total Users of Covernment Inspected Frozen Processed Sea Food | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (356) | (291) | (65) |
|  | ¢ | \& |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Buy more | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Buy about the same | 85.1 | 86.3 | 80.0 |
| Buy less | - | - | - |
| Don't know | 5.9 | 5.8 | 6.2 |
| No answer | 7.6 | 6.5 | 12.3 |

## Table 43

IF GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR CRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD WERE AVAILABLE WOULD

THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY MORE OR LESS?

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Total Establishments Not Know- } \\
\text { Ing Government Inspected or } \\
\text { Graded Frozen Processed } \\
\text { Sea Food Was Available } \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

Total
(130)
100.0
3.9

Say they would buy more
Say they would buy less
About the same
70.0
23.1
3.0

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (349) | (160) | (123) | (36) | (30) |
|  | 中 | 中 | $\underline{L}$ | \& | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Have served frozen processed sea food before | 10.9* | 10.0 | 11.4 | 11.1 | 13.3 |
| No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods | 5.4 | 6.9 | 4.9 | 5.6 | - |
| Prefer to serve fresh fish | 4.0 | 3.1 | 5.7 |  | 6.7 |
| Lacked flavor - own prepared fish has better flavor | . 9 | - | . 8 | 5.6 | - |
| More expensive than other forms of fish | . 6 | . 6 | . 8 | - | - |
| All others | . 6 | - | - | - | 6.7 |
| Have not served frozen processed sea food before | 88.5* | 90.0 | 87.8 | 88.9 | 83.4 |
| Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not in that business | 51.6 | 53.1 | 52.8 | 55.6 | 33.3 |
| Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, Presh fish available all year | 16.9 | 15.0 | 16.3 | 16.7 | 30.0 |
| Like taste, freshness of fresh fish - don't trust frozen food, fresh fish tastes better, some frozen is kept too long | 14.0 | 13.1 | 14.6 | 11.1 | 20.0 |
| Unable to handle preparation - no equipment, not enough room, no time, would need extra help | 3.4 | 2.5 | 5.7 | 2.8 | - |
| Just opened, don't know what I'll sell | 2.9 | 5.0 | 1.6 | - | - |
| Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh, prepare ourselves | 2.0 | 2.5 | . 8 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
| No storage facilities freezer | 1.7 | 3.1 | . 8 | - | - |
| All others | 1.4 | 1.3 | . 8 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
| Don't know, no ans'em | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
| Don't know | . 6 | - | . 8 | - | 3.3 |

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

## Table 45

DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES POR KERPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume


DO ESTABLISHMENIS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Nonusera of Sea Food and Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food

|  | Total | Nonusers of Sea Food | Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (349) |  |  |
|  | $\underline{6}$ | ¢ | 2 |
|  | 100.0 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 70.5 | 33.0 | 37.5 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 28.4 | 15.5 | 12.9 |
| No answer | 1.1 | . 8 | . 3 |

## distribution of sample

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

## Table a <br> TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM MEALS SERVED DURING 1957 OR LAST FISCAL YEAR

According to Type of Establishmenta

|  | Total | Public Restaurants | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Schools, } \\ & \text { Plants } \end{aligned}$ | Hospitals, Welfare <br> Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (842) | (615) | (51) | (50) | (126) |
|  | $\underline{4}$ | $\underline{6}$ | \& | $\pm$ | 2 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total Receiptr |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 32.3 | 33.7 | 19.6 | 30.0 | 31.7 |
| \$10,000-39,999 | 34.5 | 36.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 32.6 |
| \$40,000-99,999 | 18.1 | 17.1 | 27.5 | 12.0 | 21.4 |
| \$ 100,000 and over | 15.1 | 12.8 | 27.5 | 32.0 | 14.3 |

AMOUNT ESTABLISHMEINTS SFENT FOR FOOD DURING PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establlshments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (842) | (615) | (51) | (50) | (126) | (272) | (291) | (152) | (127) |
|  | \& | \% | \& | \& | 2 | \& | \& | ¢ | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$1,000 | 6.8 | 6.8 | - | - | 12.6 | 26.9 | - | - | - |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 12.3 | 14.9 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 9.9 | 41.3 | 4.8 | - | 1.4 |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 2.9 | - | 12.6 | 10.5 | 15.7 | 2.2 | - |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 16.8 | 18.4 | 17.2 | 16.7 | 9.9 | 16.2 | 31.5 | 5.6 | 1.4 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 2.9 | 16.7 | 12.6 | 2.9 | 21.9 | 4.4 | 1.4 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 19.1 | 21.0 | 11.4 | 4.2 | 19.7 | - | 23.9 | 44.4 | 4.3 |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 22.8 | - | 1.4 | - |  | 26.7 | 2.9 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | 10.0 | 7.2 | 19.9 | 33.2 | 8.5 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 16.7 | 32.3 |
| \$100,000-249,999 | 5.5 | 3.9 | 8.6 | 25.0 | 4.3 | 1 | 8 | - | 32.3 |
| \$ $\$ 250,000$ and over | 4.7 | 3.3 | 11.4 | - | 8.5 | 1.1 | . 8 | - | 24.0 |

Table c

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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| Total Establishments | Totel | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | A.1 Others | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | (842) | (615) | (51) | (50) | (126) | (272) | (291) | (152) | (127) |
|  | ¢ | \& | \% | \$ | \% | 8 | \& | \& | t |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under 5\% for food | 1.3 | . 6 | 5.5 | - | 2.8 | 2.7 | 12 | 1.0 | 3.8 3.8 |
| 5-14\% | 2.2 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 14.3 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 3.8 |
| 15-244 | 1.7 | 6.6 | 5.5 | 19.0 | 5.6 | 5.4 11.6 | 6.6 | 1.0 5.8 | 2.5 |
| 25-34\% | 6.7 | 6.3 | - | 19.0 | 8.2 | 12.6 | 6.0 |  |  |
| 35-44\% | 27.2 | 25.6 | 27.8 | 23.7 | 34.7 | 21.4 | 24.7 | 30.1 | 36.2 |
| 45-54\% | 40.4 | 43.1 | 41.7 | 14.3 | 34.7 | 34.8 | 42.2 | 43.6 | 40.0 |
| 55-64\% | 11.5 | 13.9 | 11.1 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 15.1 | 13.6 | 7.5 |
| 65-74\% | 5.6 | 5.7 | 2.8 | 9.5 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 7.2 | 3.9 | 5.0 |
| 75-84\% | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 1.8 | 1.0 | - |
| 85-94\% | . 4 | . 3 | - | 4.8 | - | - | 1.2 | - | 12 |
| 95-100\% | . 4 |  | - | 4.8 | 1.4 | . 9 | - | - | 12 |

## Table d

## AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

## According to type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| Total Establishments |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{842}$ |


| Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 615 | 51 | 50 | 12¢6 | $\underline{272}$ | 291 | 152 | 127 |
| 99 | 611 | 222 | 140 | 37 | 75 | 164 | 536 |
| 11 | 90 | 40 | 13 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 75 |
| 62 | 112 | 149 | 94 | 16 | 29 | 73 | 333 |
| 4 | - | 3 | 5 | ** | 3 | 4 | 17 |
| 66 | 135 | 156 | 73 | 14 | 33 | 76 | 340 |
| 9 | 22 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 50 |
| 57 | 93 | 141 | 58 | 11 | 32 | 74 | 264 |
| 5 |  | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 15 |

* Less than one half meal.


## AVERAGE PRICE PER MEAL SERVED

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (842) | (615) | (51) | (50) | (126) | (272) | (291) | (152) | (127) |
|  | \& | \& | \& | \& | \& | \& | \& | \& |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Under \$. 25 | . 2 | - 3 | ${ }^{-}$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | . 4 | - | . 7 | 5 |
| \$. $25-.49$ | 18.8 | 15.0 | 41.2 | 6.0 | 33.2 | 30.9 | 15.5 | 14.5 | 5.5 |
| \$. $50-.74$ | 28.0 | 29.7 | 35.3 | 8.0 | 24.6 | 28.3 | 33.4 | 26.3 | 17.4 |
| \$.75-.99 | 20.4 | 23.3 | 7.8 | 4.0 | 18.3 | 19.1 | 24.1 | 21.1 | 14.2 |
| \$1.00-1.49 | 13.1 | 15.6 | 3.9 | 10.0 | 5.6 | 10.3 | 12.0 | 17.1 | 16.5 |
| \$1.50-1.99 | 4.5 | 6.0 | - | - | . 8 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 11.0 |
| \$2.00-2.49 | 2.0 | 2.4 | - | - | 1.6 | . 7 | 1.4 | 3.3 | 4.7 |
| \$2.50-2.99 | 1.7 | 1.5 | - | - | 4.0 | - | . 7 | 3.9 | 4.7 |
| \$3.00-3.99 | 1.2 | 1.1 | - | - | 2.4 | - | - 3 | 1.3 | 5.5 |
| \$4.00-4.99 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| \$5.00 and over | . 1 | . 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | . 8 |
| So answer | 6.1 | 4.9 | 5.9 | 14.0 | 8.7 | 3.7 | 5.8 | 3.9 | 14.2 |
| Nonprofit establiahment | 3.9 | - | 5.9 | 58.0 | . 8 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 5.5 |

NUMBER OF REGULAR EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PREPARING AND SERVING FOOD
According to Sales Volume

Total establishments

Average number per establishment

|  | Less <br> Than <br> Total <br> $\$ 42$ | $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 10,000$ <br> 39,999 | $\$ 40,000-$ <br> 99,999 | $\$ 100,000$ <br> and <br> Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 272 | 291 |  | 152 | 127 |

Table g

SEATING CAPACITY OF ESTABLISHMENTS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Otbers } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | and Over |
| Total establishments | 842 | 615 | 51 | 50 | 126 | 272 | 291 | 152 | 127 |
| Average seating capacity, in seats | 91 | 57 | 409 | 168 | 102 | 34 | 44 | 114 | 302 |

## NUMEER OF DAYS OF THE KEEK ON WHICH ESTABLISHMENTS SERVE MEALS

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Restaurants | Scbools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare <br> Sstablishments | All Others | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (842) | (615) | (51) | (50) | (126) | (272) | (291) | (152) | (127) |
|  | \& | \& | \& | \& | 2 | \& | \& | $\pm$ |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Serve on 7 deys | 47.7 | 45.7 | 13.7 | 96.0 | 52.4 | 39.7 | 47.1 | 54.6 | 58.2 |
| Serve on 6 days | 35.4 | 40.8 | 9.8 | 2.0 | 32.5 | 36.8 | 38.5 | 30.9 | 30.7 |
| Serve on 5 dyas | 15.9 | 12.7 | 74.5 | - | 14.3 | 22.0 | 14.4 | 13.8 | 8.7 |
| Serve on less than 5 days | . 6 | - 5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | - | 1.5 | - | -7 | - |
| No answer | . 4 | - 3 | - | - | . 8 | - | - | - | 2.4 |

Table i

## PERCENTAGE OF ESTABLISHMENTS SERVING SPECIALTZED TYPES OF FOOD

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (842) | (272) | (291) | (152) | (127) |
|  | 2 | $\pm$ | q | \& | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments with no specialty | 79.9 | 82.7 | 75.9 | 80.9 | 81.9 |
| Establishments with specialty | 20.1* | 17.3 | 24.1 | 19.1 | 18.1 |
| Italian food | 6.2 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 4.6 | 2.4 |
| Kosher | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 |
| Steak or chophouse | 2.5 | . 7 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 6.3 |
| Barbecue | 2.4 | 3.3 | 3.1 | - | 1.6 |
| Chinese food | 1.5 | . 4 | 2.7 | 2.0 | . 8 |
| Chicken specialty | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.7 | - | . 8 |
| Sea food | . 7 | - | 1.0 | 1.3 | . 8 |
| Mexican, Spanish | .7 | .7 | 1.4 | - | 8 |
| French food | . 1 | - | - | - | . 8 |
| All others | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 2.4 |

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

