## FROZEN PROCESSED FISH AND SHELLFISH

## CONSUMPTION IN

## INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC EATING PLACES

## Houston, Texas

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

United States Department of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, Secretary Fish and Wildlife Service, Arnie J. Suomela, Commissioner
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Donald L. McKernan, Director

INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC EATING PLACES are among the best of all potential markets for frozen fishery products. in recognition of this, a survey was undertaken to obtain information on the consumption of frozen processed fish and shellfishlin 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 Porcedures
Circular 67 - Atlanta, Georgia
Circular 68 - Chicago, Illinois
Circular 69 - Cleveland, Ohio
Circular 70 - Denver, Colorado
Circular 71 - Houston, Texas
Circular 72 - Los Angeles, California
Circular 73 - New York, New York
Circular 74 - Omaha, Nebraska
Circular 75 - Portland, Oregon
Circular 76 - Springfield, Massachusetts

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

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

# FROZEN PROCESSED FISH AND SHELLFISH CONSUMPTION IN INSTITUTIONS <br> AND <br> PUBLIC EATING PLACES 

--------------0--------------

HOUSTON, TEXAS

Prepared in the Division of Industrial Research and Services
Branch of Market Development

CIRCULAR 71

WASHINGTON - NOVEMBER 1959

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ..... 1-4
DETAILED FINDINGS
1 Did the Establishment Buy Sea Food in the Preceding Twelve Months? ..... 5
2 Did the Establishment Buy Frozen Processed Sea Foodin the Preceding Twelve Months?6
3 Frozen Processed Fish Bought in November, 1958
How Processed Before Purchase ..... 7
4 Quantity of Frozen Processed Fish Bought in November, 1958 ..... 8
5 Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with Prepreparation of Frozen Processed Fish ..... 9
$6 \quad$ Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Quality and Condition of Frozen Processed Fish ..... 9
7 Package Sizes of Frozen Processed Fish Bought in November, 1958 and Average Number of Servings Per Pound ..... 10
8 Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Types and Sizes of Frozen Processed Fish Packages ..... 10
9 Percentage of Frozen Processed Fish Served Fried,Broiled, Baked, and in Other Ways11
10
Frozen Processed Shellfish Bought in November, 1958 How Processed Before Purchase
12
12
11 Quantity of Frozen Processed Shellfish Bought in November, 1958 ..... 13
12
Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with Prepreparation of Frozen Processed Shellfish ..... 14
13
Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Quality and Condition of Frozen Processed Shellifish ..... 14
14
Package Sizes of Frozen Processed Shellfish Bought in November, 1958 and Average Number of Servings Per Pound ..... 1515Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Types and Sizesof Frozen Processed Shellfish Packages15
Percentage of Frozen Processed Shellfish Served Fried, Broiled, Baked and in Other Ways ..... 16
17 ..... 18 ..... 17
Types of Portions Bought in November, 1958 ..... 171920
Amount of Portions Bought by Establishments, aCompared to the Previous Year18
Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Quality andCondition of Portions18
21 Frozen Processed Fish - For What Reasons? ..... 1922
Advantages of Using Portions ..... 19
Disadvantages of Using Portions ..... 20
24
Do Establishments Think Customers Prefer Portionsto Other Frozen Processed Fish - For WhatReasons?20
25
Average Weight of Portions and Average Number of Servings Per Package ..... 21
26
Satisfaction with the Size of Portions in a Package ..... 21
27
Percentage of Portions Served Fried, Broiled,
Baked, and in Other Ways ..... 22
28
Do Establishments Cook Portions While Still Frozen? ..... 23
29 Cost of Using Portions, as Compared to Other Frozen Cost of Using Portions, as Compared to Other Fr
Processed Fish and Reasons Why Portions are Thought More or Less Expensive ..... 23
30 When Ordering Portions from Suppliers, Do Establishments Specify the Kind of Fish? ..... 24
31
Would the Establishments Like to Have Other Portion
Controlled Sea Food Items Not Now Available? ..... 24
32
Reasons Establishments Did Not Buy Portions During November, 1958 ..... 25
32 ..... 25
Was Price a Reason Establishments Did Not Buy Portions?33Types of Supplier Providing Frozen Processed Sea Food
3435
to Establishments ..... 26
Distance of Establishment from Main Supplier of Frozen Processed Sea Food ..... 27
Frequency of Deliveries of Frozen Processed Sea Food ..... 28
Can Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food ImproveServices to Establishments?29
37
Amount Spent for Frozen Processed Sea Food During Preceding Twelve Months ..... 30
38

Profitability to Establishments of Frozen Processed39404142434445Sea Food and Other High Protein Foods31
Do the Establishments Know they can buy Government
Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food? ..... 32
Do the Establishments Buy Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food? ..... 32
Reasons Establishments Buy Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food ..... 33
Has Government Inspection Affected the Amount of Frozen Processed Sea Food Bought by the Establishments? ..... 34
If Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed
Sea Food were Available Would the Establishment
Buy More or Less?34
(Information has been omitted as too few EstablishmentsQualified to Respond)
Previous Use of Frozen Processed Sea Food ByNonusers and Reasons for Stopping Use orfor Never Using35Do Establishments Have Cold Storage Facilities for
Keeping Frozen Processed Sea Food?
According to Type of Establishments and36
According to Nonusers of Sea Food and Users NotUsing Frozen Processed Sea Food37
a Total Receipts from Meals Served During 1957 or Last Fiscal Year ..... 38
b Amount Establishments Spent for Food During
Previous Twelve Months ..... 39
c Percentage of Total Operating Cost Spent for
Food in Previous Twelve Months ..... 40
d Average Number of Meals Served by Establishments ..... 41
e Average Price Per Meal Served ..... 42
$f \quad$ Number of Regular Employees Engaged in Preparing and Serving Food ..... 43
$g$ Seating Capacity of Establishments ..... 43
h Number of Days of the Week on Which Establishments Serve Meals ..... 44
i Percentage of Establishments Serving Specialized Typesof Food45

A. Use of Frozer Processei Sea Food (Tables 1. 2)

Five sixths of all tree establiarments in Houston said they bought ses fooc ir. the previous twelve months. Among buyers of sea food, the majority said they made purchases of sea tood il the frozen processed form.

Thirty-xine per cent of yll the establistments said they nad bought frozen processed fish in Noverber. 1958; 33 per cent. said threy fad bught frozen processed shellfish; and 19 per cent Eaid thev :aj bought portions.

Among institutions (suct. as sahools aia hospitala), the inciderice of use of frozen pronessed ses food wes greater than amorg public eatirg places.

Of the ter, cities in the survey, Houston ranked fiffth, if terms of the percentage cif all estiatifsrmerts buying frozen processed sea foon.
E. Frozer. Processed Fish Pachases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Species ard Amourt. of Prepreparation (Tables 3. 4)

Alnost one third of the users of frozen p;ocu essed fish bought colfish fillets durlijg November, 1958. This was the leading itey in Houston in terms of tethl pounds purchased.

Ocean perch fillets were bought, by a sizable number of Houstor estatlishments; while
coafish steaks and fish cakes were popular it the EOuston sinools.

Codfish fillets were frequently bought ir Loz Angeles, Omaha, and New York, while ocear.
perch fillets were purchased widely and in substintial quantities in the Souttern and Mifdle Western cities included i! the survey.
2. Att.itudez Towara Preprepar ition ens Quality ard Condit on of Fisb (Tables 5, bi

A great majorsty uf Houstor purctinsers were antisfied wilt the presert. prepreparation of fish, and with the quality and corditior of the fish.

This was gererslly true for the ter. ities included in the survey.
3. Packsgine of Fish̀ (Tables 7, 8)

Houstor e.tikilshment,s nost typical ly bought frozen prosesied fish in 5 po and packages.
4. Methods of Preporirg and Servinif Fier Table 9)

Fryjng wis the most usual method of preparing fisb among Houston establishments. Trie riverage establistment ser"ed 79 per cent o: it,s
fish fried.

Fry, ng was the leading method in all ter. cities of the stuay.
C. Frozen Processed Shellfish - Purchases. Attituajes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Species and Type of Prepreparat:on (Tables 1., 11)

Half of the Rouston fituters of stictisise bought breaded strim: in November, 1958. Two fifths of the establishments bought raw shrimp. These two tems were also first and second in हouston, in ierm: of total quantity purchased.

Breaded shrimp and raw shrimp were tought widely and in large quar.tities in ail of the other citfes included ir. the stuiy.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation; Toward Qualit: and Conditior o? Shellfist
(Taples 12, 13)
All but a smail number of purchasers were sstisfiec with the present prepreparation of shellfish, and with the quality and condition of the shellfisb which they bought.

The same held generally true for the otber clities in the survey.

## 3. Paskaging of Shellfish (Tables I4, 15)

Breaded shrimp was ctiaracteristically bought ir 3 pound packages in Houston. Raw shrimp was most often bought in 5 pound packages.
4. Methods of Preparing ar i Serving Shellfish (Table 10)

Frying was the most popular way of preparing shellpist in Hoistor. Me typical establishment served two thircs of its sheilfist fried.

As with fish, frying was the leading method of preparige shellfish in all ten cities of the stuay.
D. Portion Controlled Sea Food - Purchases: Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purcbases: Type of Prepreparation
(Tables 1. 17, 18, 19)
Almost sififtr of all the establishments in Houston bought portions du-ing November, 1958 Houston rarked fifth in percentage of establisnmerts myjng portions.

In Houstor, portions were most widely bougrit uncookei ini rreaded; and t,te quantity purchasea waz groater thar that of any other type of preprepiration.

Pelf of tho purchasers of portions said that they were curreatly buying about the same amount of portions as the year before. About e duarter sald they were buying more while i4 per cert suld they were buying less.
2. Attitudes Tow $\frac{1}{22}$ rd Portions Tables 20,21 , $22,23,24)$

Nearly all establisments said they were satisfied with the quality and condrion of portions.

Atoit ore saxth of the users of portions said tres thought the guglity of portions was bet－ ter ths：that $0^{* \prime}$ otber froach processed fish． Almost four fiftis rates the giality as atout the sime．


|  | \％O： <br> Users <br> Citing |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sos．venserce．east of preparation | 55 |
| Fȧt，さimeごさing | 37 |
| Size of portions．wriferm pe：ntions | 30 |
| Can ontrol tooj costs bf ter－ |  |
| know profijt． | 1.8 |

 zavantege to us？ne portions．f wisriety of die sdventsees wero ment ionei．

Ujers of fortions generialy thoight＊＂1e＇r cus－ tomer＝liked rortions as well as otho tynes
 cent sowinf ；＇et thej customers like fortinns les：thar other tJpes of frozer：procesised int food．

## 3．Pastaging of Portiors（Tables 25，26）

Holstor purchssers terdec to biy portions ir phekages of rbout the same size as those pre－ ferred by purchasero in otrer cities．Jihe average weight of a package of portjons for the city was 5.9 pounds．

However，they terded to buy individuzl por－ tions of larger：ze．The average weight of an individuel portion was 7.8 ounces．

Almost all estarlishmerts，in Houstor and tne other nine cities，said they were sat isfind with the size of portions in the paci．$=$ ges．

4．Nie：tols of Freparisag and Scrisng Portiors
（Tables 27，？？）

Frving was the most widely used metrof if preparine and servine portions $i:$ rioiston with $9 l$ per vent of the establishmerts senv－ ing ther：：his way．The average establist－ merit servez D？per cent of its portions fred．

Frying was the ？ading method in nine of the ten citiea of the study．The except，ion was Springfieli，Massachusetts．where baking was the most popilar method of preparation．

Five ：Axtr，- the Houstom estanlishmerts using portions cooked them while frozen．

Cost of Using Portions（Tatle 29i
Only a tentt of the establishments ising portions saif they were more expensive than other forms of frozen processed fish．A lsrge majority of users considered them less expensive．or rated them about the same．

Є．Miscellaneous Finkings About Portions （Tables 30， 31 ）

Three quarters of the Houston establishments sqid they specified the kind of fish wher or－ dering portions．

Only 3 per cent of the users suggested asch
new portion items, not now available, whick. they would like to have.
7. Nonusers of Portions (Table 32)

Establishments whict used Erozen processea sea food, but ine poriions, gave a number of ressons for not buying portions: they used Iresh fisn, they sold comparetively little Eish, they served other types of Aist
E. Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food
(Tables 33, 34, 35, 36)
Establishments in Houston tended to buy frozer processed sic food fron sea food wholesalers. usually less than cen miles away, to have it delivered once s week,玉゙u to be satisfied witk the service of the suppliers.

Sea food wholesalers supplied 58 per cent of the estsblishmerts, while Erozen food distributorz accounted for another ji per cent.

Mín suppliers were located less tban ter riles From the establishment, in 65 per cent of the sases.

In more than half the cases, deliveriea were made once a week, while deliveries were made from two to four
times $e$ week in about 20 pe $=$ cert of the sstabliskments.
Only a small fraction of the purchasers said they couls think of ways in which the auppliers could improve their services.
F. Expenditures for Frozen Processed Sea Food; Iis Profitability (Tables 37, 38)

Two fifths of the establishments reporting in Houston 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 $\$ 49,999$. Other establishments were between these two extremes, with the median coming at $\$ 383$.

More than two thirds of the profit-making establishments which expressed on ofinion, corsidered frozen processeç sea food more profitahle than other high protein foods.
G. Governfert Inspection of Frozen Processed Sea Food - Awareness. Effect, and Attitudes
(Tables 30, 40, 41, 42)
All but 8 per cent of the establishments in Houston were aware that they could buy frozen processed sea food, whick had been inspected or graded hy the United States Government.

Of the establishments aware that they couid buy
Government inspected or graded sea food, alunost ell said they had bought some. Wher. purchasers were asked if the inspectior hed iffected the amount of frozen processed ses food which they bought, 5 per cent said the inspection had causer them to buy more.
H. Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food; Cold Storage Facilities (Tables 43, 44, 45)

Most nonusers in Houston sald they had never bought fro. zer processed sea food with the main reasons given that they sold little or no fish, or used fresh fish.

Findings regarding cold storage facilities among nonusers in Houston may be sumarized as follows:

Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food

Use sea food but not frozen processed sea foon 46
No cold storage facilities

## DETAILED FINDINGS

Table 1

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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 \\ 39,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (288) | (196) | (92) | (101) | (91) | (44) | (52) |
|  | ¢ | ¢ | \& | $\pm$ | \% | \& | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought sea food | 83.0 | 78.8 | 98.3 | 75.4 | 86.5 | 89.3 | 87.0 |
| Bought frozen processed sea food | 58.4 | 49.9 | 88.9 | 44.5 | 62.4 | 80.0 | 62.0 |
| Bought frozen processed fish | 38.6 | 28.2 | 76.1 | 27.2 | 42.4 | 56.0 | 41.0 |
| Bought frozen processed shellfish | 33.0 | 36.8 | 19.7 | 20.4 | 34.1 | 52.0 | 41.0 |
| Bought portions | 18.8 | 18.6 | 19.7 | 15.7 | 18.8 | 30.7 | 16.0 |
| No, did not buy sea food | 17.0 | 21.2 | 1.7 | 24.6 | 13.5 | 10.7 | 13.0 |

Table 2

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

|  | Total | Type of EstablishmentPrblicEatingPlaces Institutions |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | (245) | (155) | (90) | (79) | (79) | (40) | (47) |
|  | 中 | ¢ | \% | 中 | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought frozen processed sea food | 70.3 | 63.3 | 90.4 | 59.0 | 72.1 | 89.6 | 71.3 |
| No, did not buy frozen processed sea food | 29.7 | 36.7 | 9.6 | 41.0 | 27.9 | 10.4 | 28.7 |

According to Sales Volume

|  |  | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \＄40，000 and Over |  | Total | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  | 中 | 中 | 中 | q |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | （119） | （32） | （40） | （57） | $\frac{\text { Halibut }}{\text { Breaded }}$ | 1.0 | － | － | 2.4 |
|  | \％ | \％ | \＆ | \％ | Fillets | 1.4 | － | 4.2 | － |
|  |  |  |  |  | Steaks | ． 5 | － | 1.4 | － |
|  | 100．0＊ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Breaded fillets | ． 5 | 1.9 | － | 3.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Raw | 1.4 | － | － | 3.6 |
| Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 3.4 | 1.9 | 4.8 1.2 | 7.3 2.4 | $\frac{\text { Ocean Perch }}{\text { Breaded }}$ | 1.0 |  | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| Breaded fillets | ． 5 | － | 1.2 |  | Preaded | 14.0 | 7.7 | 15.3 | 16.9 |
| Cod |  |  |  |  | Steaks | ． 5 | － | 1.4 | － |
| ${ }_{\text {Fillets }}$ | 30.9 | 11.5 | 27.8 | 45.8 | Breaded fillets | 2.4 | － | 5.9 |  |
| Steaks | 35.3 | 65.4 | 31.9 | 19.3 | Raw | 1.0 | － | － | 2.4 |
| Breaded fillets | 1.4 | 3.8 | 1.4 | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 7.2 | － | 13.9 | 6.0 | $\frac{\text { Redfish }}{\text { Ereaded }}$ | ． 5 | － | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Fish Cakes |  |  |  |  | Fillets | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.2 | － |
| Breaded | 1.4 | － | 4.2 | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 33.3 | 61.5 | 29.2 | 19.3 | $\frac{\text { Red Snapper }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Flounder |  |  |  |  | Raw | 1.4 | － | 3.6 | $7 \cdot 3$ |
| Fillets | 9.7 | 9.6 | 12.5 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 2.9 | － | － | 7.2 | $\frac{\text { Salmon }}{\text { Steaks }}$ | ． .4 | － | 1.4 | 4.8 |
| Haddock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | ¢ 7 | 1.9 1.9 | 8.3 | 6.0 13.3 | $\frac{\text { Trout }}{\text { Breadec }}$ | 1.0 | － | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Fillets | －． 4 | 1.9 |  | 3.6 | Fillets | 1.9 | － | 1.2 | － |
| Steaks | 3.4 | 7.7 | － | 3.6 | Steaks | 1.4 | － | － 6 | $7 \cdot$ |

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

|  | Total Pounds | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Average }}{\text { All }} \\ & \text { Establishme } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { er of Pounds } \\ & \text { User } \\ & \text { Establishments } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catfish |  |  |  |  |  | Average Num | er of Pounds |
| Fillets | 467 | . 9 | 66.7 |  | Total | All | User |
| Breaded fillets | 60 | (b) | 60.0 |  | Pounds | Establisbments | Establishments |
| Cod |  |  |  | Ocean Perch |  |  |  |
| $\underline{\text { Fillets }}$ ( $^{\text {cod }}$ | 23,359 | 43.6 | 364.9 | Breaded | 34 | (b) | 17.0 |
| Steaks | 2,081 | 3.9 | 28.5 | Fillets | 6,297 | 11.7 | 217.1 |
| Breaded fillets | 90 | (b) | 30.0 | Steaks | 3 | (a) | 3.0 |
| Raw | 2,465 | 4.6 | 164.3 | Breaded fillets |  | (b) | $20.8$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1,360 |  |  |
| Fisb Cakes |  | (b) | 74.0 | Redfish |  |  |  |
| Ereaded | (a) | (b) | - | Breaded | 30 | (b) | 30.0 |
| Haw |  |  |  | Fillets | 235 | (b) | 117.5 |
| Flounder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 664 | 1.2 | 33.2 | Red Snapper |  |  |  |
| Raw | 147 | (b) | 24.5 | Fillets | 410 | . 8 | 205.0 |
| Haddock |  |  |  | Salmon |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 226 | (b) | 37.7 | Steaks | 230 | (b) | 46.0 |
| Fillets | 1,622 | 3.0 | 90.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Steaks | 36 | (b) | 12.0 | $\frac{\text { Prout }}{\text { Breaded }}$ |  |  |  |
| Raw | 90 | (b) | 12.9 | Breaded | 40 203 | (b) | 20.0 50.8 |
| Halibut |  |  |  | Steaks | 45 | (b) | 15.0 |
| Breaded | 150 | (b) | 75.0 | Raw | 3 | (a) | 1.0 |
| Fillets | 18 | (a) | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Steaks | (a) | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded Pillets | (a) | - | ${ }^{-}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 210 | (b) | 70.0 |  |  |  |  |

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

## Table 5

SATISFACTION OR DTSSATISFACTTON WTTH PREPREPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISE

Total Purchases of cod | Total |
| ---: |
| User |
| (1) |

$\begin{array}{r}$|  Total  |
| :---: |
|  Users  |
| $(1)$ | <br>

$\underline{100.0} \\
\hline\end{array}$
Prefer more prepreparation of cod
Prefer less prepreparation of cod
Prefer prepreparation as it is
No answer

Total Purchases of Fish Cakes
Prefer more prepreparation of fish cakes Prefer less prepreparation of fish cakes Prefer prepreparation as it is

Total Purchases of Flounder 100.0

Prefer more prepreparation of flounder Prefer less prepreparation of flounder Prefer less prepreparation of
Prefer prepreparation as it is
100.0
3.8
96.2
(1) The percentages shown in the body of the table are computed on the total number of purchases of each species of f1sh.

Many users bought more than one species. Some establishments also hought a species prepared in tho different ways. For example, haddock fillets and haddock steaks. This was counted as two purchases of the apecies.
Because purchases of many species were few in number, the species are not included in the table.

## Total Furchases of Haddock

Q8.1 Prefer more prepreparation of haddock
1.9 Prefer less prepreparation of haddock Prefer less prepreparation
Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer

Table 6

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WIIH QUAL ITY AND CONDTPION

| Total |
| ---: |
| Users |
| (1) |
| 中 |
| L |
| 100.0 |

Prefer more prepreparation of ocean perch Prefer prepreparation as it is

OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish, November, 2958

Satisfied

## Table 7

PACKAGE SIZES OF FROZETN TROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND (1) $\frac{\text { Total }}{2}$

Total Purchasers of Cod Fillets

## 100.0

1 pound package
3 pound packages
5 pound packages

5 pound packages
7 pound packages
10 pound packages
15 pound packrges
50 pound packages and over
Average Dumber of servings per pound


Total Purchasers of
Flounder Fillets
100.0
per pound

Total Purchasers of Ocean Ferch Pillets $\quad 100.0$


## Table 8

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITR TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN
FROCESSED PISH PACKAGES
To:al
Total Users of Frozen Processed

Fish, November, 1958

## Satispied

(1) The table ahows flgures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur most of ten in the city. Sometime figures are shown for package sizes but not average number of servings per pound. In these cases the dita on servings per pound is limited.

The percertios io the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one specie: i fish, preprepared in one manner.

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Than \＄10，000 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \＄100，000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | （119） | （32） | （40） | （24） | （23） |
|  | \％ | 中 | 中 | 中 | d |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried None fried | 5.8 | 5.8 | 1.4 | 11.9 | 7.3 |
| 1－14\％ | － | － | － | 4.8 | 22.0 |
| 15－34\％ | 5.3 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 4.8 4.8 | 22.0 |
| 35－64\％ | 8.7 2.4 | 1.9 1.9 | 8.3 4.2 | 4.8 | 2.4 |
| $65-84 \%$ Over $84 \%$ | 73.5 | 84.6 | 81.9 | 71.4 | 46.3 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused． | 4.3 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 7.1 | － |
| Average percentage served | 78.8 | 85.6 | 86.6 | 74.9 | 60.9 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled | 80.2 | 88.5 | 84.6 | 83.4 | 58.6 |
| None broiled | 2．9 | 88. | 4.2 | 7.1 | － |
| $1-14 \%$ $15-34 \%$ | 3.9 | 1.9 | 1.4 | － | 14.6 |
| $15-34 \%$ $35-64 \%$ | 4.8 | 1.9 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 12.2 |
| 65－84\％ | 2.9 | － | － | － | 14.6 |
| Over 84\％ | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.4 | － | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 4.3 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 7.1 | － |
| Average percentage served | 6.9 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 20.5 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  | 88.5 | 95.8 | 73.8 | 75.7 |
| None baked $1-14 \%$ | 85.5 .5 | 1.9 | ， | － |  |
| 15－34\％ | 2.9 | － | － | － | 14.6 |
| 35－64\％ | 1.9 | － |  | 2.4 | 7.3 |
| 65－84\％ | 1.5 | － |  | 4.8 | 2.4 |
| Over 84\％ | 3.4 | 3.8 | ． 2 | 11.9 | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 4.3 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 7.1 |  |
| Average percentage served | 6.2 | 3.9 | － | 16.9 | 9.0 |
| Establishm | 91.3 | 94.2 | 88.8 | 92.9 | 90．： |
| None 1 － $14 \%$ | － | － | － | － | － 0.8 |
| 15－34\％ | 2.9 | － | 2.8 | － | 9.8 |
| 35－64\％ | 1.5 | － | 4.2 | － |  |
| 65－84\％ | － |  |  | － |  |
| Over 84\％ | 4． 3 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 7.1 | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 1.5 | － | 2.9 | － | 2.4 |


|  | Total | Less Than $\$ 40,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | (97) | (52) | (45) |
|  | \% | \% | 中 |
|  | $\underline{100.0 *}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Clams |  |  |  |
| Breaded | . 6 | - | 1.3 |
| Crabs |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 3.4 | 2.1 | 5.0 |
| Breaded | 1.7 | - | 3.8 |
| Cooked and deviled | . 6 | 1.0 | - |
| Breaded and stuffed | 1.7 | - | 3.8 |
| Deviled and stuffed | 1.1 | - | 2.5 |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | 5.6 | - | 12.5 |
| Canned | . 6 | 1.0 |  |
| Raw; whole, clean | 6.2 | 7.2 | 5.0 |
| Lobster |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 6 | - | 1.3 |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | 4.5 | 3.1 | 6.3 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 9.0 | 8.2 | 10.0 |
| Oystera |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 6 | - | 1.3 |
| Breaded | 7.3 | 6.2 | 8.8 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 10.2 | 7.2 | 13.8 |
| Scallops |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 6 | - | 1.3 |
| Breaded | 4.0 | 3.1 | 5.0 |
| Canned | . 6 | 1.0 | - |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 4.5 | 3.1 | 6.3 |
| Shrimp |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 3.4 | - | 7.5 |
| Breaded | 50.8 | 57.7 | 42.5 |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.1 | - | 2.5 |
| Raw; clean, deheaded, shelled and deveined | 39.5 | 33.0 | 47.5 |

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


Table 12

SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OP FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLLFISH

|  | Total <br> Users <br> (1) |  | Total <br> Users <br> (I) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2}$ |  | L |
| Total Purchases of Crabs | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Oysters | 100.0 |
| eparation of crabs | - | Prefer more prepreparation of oysters |  |
| eparation of crabs | 13.5 | Prefer less prepreparation of oysters |  |
| tion as it is | 83.8 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 96.9 |
|  | 2.7 | No answer | 3.1 |
| Total Purchases of Lobster | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Shrimp | 100.0 |
| eparation of lobster | - | Prefer more prepreparation of shrimp | 1.2 |
| eparation of lobster | $\cdots$ | Prefer less prepreparation of shrimp | 1.2 |
| tion as it is | 96.0 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 97.0 |
|  | 4.0 | No answer | . 6 |

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

## WTHE QUALTITY AND CONDITION OF

FROZEN PROCESSFD SHELLFISH
Tot,
Total Users of Frozen Processed
Shellfisb, November, 1958(97)\&
Satisfied ..... 87.0
Dissatisfied

## Table 14

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

|  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total |
|  | 2 |  | \% |
| Total Purchasers of $\qquad$ | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw | 100.0 |
| 1 pound packages | 6.7 | 1 pound paskages | 2.9 |
| 2 pound packages | 11.1 | 3 pound paekages | 5.7 |
| 3 pound packages | 43.4 | 4 pound packages | 2.9 |
| 4 pound packages | 3.3 | 5 pound packages | 72.8 |
| 5 pound packages | 32.2 | 10 pound packages | 15.7 |
| 7 pound packages | $3 \cdot 3$ |  |  |
| Average number of servings per pound | $3 \cdot 3$ | Average number of servings per pound | 4.4 |

Table 15

SATISFACTION: AND DISSAT YGFACTION
WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELIFISF PACKAGES
£
Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw
paekage
15.7

Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish

Satjefled

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

Sometimes figures are sbown 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 or the table are based on the number of establishments whicb bougbt one species of sbellfish, preprepared in one manner.

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

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Than $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |  | Total | Less Than $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish |  | (52) | (45) | Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish |  | (52) | (45) |
|  | L | \% | \& |  | \& | \& | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | 16.4 | 17.5 | 15.0 | $\frac{\text { Establishments Serving Baked }}{\text { None baked }}$ | 93.7 | 97.8 | 88.7 |
| $1-2{ }^{1}$ | 1.1 | - | 2.5 | 1-14\% | . 6 | 1.1 | - |
| $25-30$ | 4.0 | 1.0 | 7.5 | 15-34\% | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.5 |
| 3 - 5id. | 10.7 | 6.2 | 16.2 | 35-64\% | 2.3 | - | 5.0 |
| $\epsilon_{5} 0$ | 3.4 | 1.0 | 6.2 | 65-84\% | - | - | - |
| Over is $\phi$ | 62.7 | 74.3 | 48.8 | Over 84\% | -7 | - | - |
| Lu't know, no answer, refused | 1.7 | 7. | 3.8 | Don't know, no answer, refused | 1.7 | - | 3.8 |
| Average percentage served | 67.7 | 72.4 | 61.9 | Average percentage served | 1.6 | - 3 | 3.2 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  |  |  | Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 79.6 | 89.7 | 67.5 | None in other ways | 69.5 | 80.4 | 56.2 |
| 1-14\% | 6.8 | 3.1 | 11.2 | 1-14\% | 2.3 | - | 5.0 |
| 15-34\% | 6.2 | - | 13.7 | 15-34\% | 4.5 | 1.0 | 8.8 |
| 35-64\% | 2.3 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 35-64\% | 9.0 | 5.2 | 13.7 |
| 65-24\% | . 6 | 1.0 | - | 65-84\% | - | + | - |
| Over 84\% | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.5 | Over 84\% | 13.0 | 13.4 | 12.5 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 1.7 | - | 3.8 | Don't know, no answer, refused | 1.7 | - | 3.8 |
| Average percentage served | 6.3 | 5.4 | 7.4 | Averase percentage served | 18.0 | 15.1 | 21.6 |

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.

## Table 17

TYPES OF PORTIONS BOUGHT
IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total |  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { User } \\ \text { Establishments } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Portions | (59) | Cooked - breaded | 660 | 1.2 | 50.8 |
|  | \% | Cooked - plain | 963 | 1.8 | 107.0 |
|  | 100.0 * | Uncooked - breaded | 4,774 | 8.9 | 74.6 |
| Cooked - breaded | 13.2 | Uncooked - plain | 2,573 | 4.8 | 107.2 |
| Cooked - plain | 9.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Uncooked - breaded | 65.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Uncooked - plain | 24.4 |  |  |  |  |

*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
Total Users of Portions
op
100.0

Use more now 23.8
Use about the same 49.5
Use less now 13.8

Don't know

## Total

Total Purchases of Types of Portions, November, 1958

Dissatisfied

Table 21

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

Say portions better
Quality
Total
Total Users of Portions (59)
q
100.0

Uniform controlled serving - always same amount
$\frac{16.8^{*}}{8.9}$
2.0

Firmer, don't break
2.0

Taste better - tasty, like the flavor
2.0

Attractive - eye appealing
1.0

All others
2.0

Don't know - no answer 2.0
About the same
78.2

Don't know

|  |
| ---: |
|  |
|  |
| Total |
| (59) |
| q |
| 100.0 |
|  |
| $16.8 *$ |
| 8.9 |
| 2.0 |
| 2.0 |
| 2.0 |
| 1.0 |
| 2.0 |
| 2.0 |
| 78.2 |
| 5.0 |

Total

Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor, already prepared
55.4

Fast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare 36.6
Size of portions - uniform, controlled
servings, the right size serving
35.6

Can control food cost better - know profit 17.8
Economical - no waste
13.9

No bones
5.0

Sanitary - cleaner, safer 5.0
Sa
2.0
1.0
.
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 23

## DISADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

## Table 24

DO ESTABLISHMENTS THINK CUSTOMERS PREFER PORTIONS TO OTHER

## FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?

Total Users of Portions $\quad$ Total

Total
Total Users of Portions

Think customers like portions better
Customers order - seem to like them
Uniform controlled servings - always the same amount
same amount Taste better - like flavor
Attractive - eye appealing
All other
Think customers like portions less
Lack flavor - not as tasty
Lack flavor - not
Portions too smal
$\frac{6.9 *}{3.0}$

Customers don't order - ask for them
Poor quality - can't tell what is in them
Don't know - no answer
Think customers like portions about the same

Don't know
*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 NUMBER

## OF SERVINGS PER PACKAGE

| Total users of portions, November, 1958 | 59 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Average weight of package of portions, in pounds | 5.9 |
| Average number of servings per package | 22.8 |
| Average weight of individual servings, in ounces | 4.1. |
| Average weight of individual portions, in ounces | 7.3 |

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

## Table 26

SATISFACTION WITH THE SIZE OF PORTIONS IN A PACKAGE

Total

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fotal Users of Portions | (59) | Total Users of Portions | (59) |
|  | \% |  | \% |
|  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |
| Establishasht.s Serving Fried |  | Establishments Serving Baked |  |
| None fried | 8.9 | None baked | 93.0 |
| 1-14\% | - | 1-14\% | . |
| 15-34\% | 2.0 | 15-34\% | 1.0 |
| 35-64\% | 2.0 | 35-64\% | 1.0 |
| 65-84\% | 3.0 | 65-84\% | - |
| Over 84\% | 84.1 | Over 84\% | 5.0 |
| Average percentage served | 81.5 | Average percentage served | $5 \cdot 3$ |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  | Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |
| None broiled | 93.0 | None in other ways | 97.0 |
| 1-14\% | 3.0 | 1-14\% | - |
| 15-34\% | 1.0 | 15-34\% | - |
| 35-64\% | 2.0 | 35-64\% | - |
| 65-84\% | - | 65-84\% | - |
| Over 84\% | 1.0 | Over 84\% | 3.0 |
| Average percentage served | 2.4 | Average percentage served | 2.7 |

Table 28


Total Users of Portions

Say portions more expensive

Cost is more for amount of serving

$\frac{9.9}{5.9}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Price includes processing and packaging - preprepa- } \\ \text { ration would tend to raise cost } & 4.0\end{array}$
Portions less expensive
Cuts cost of preparation
Labor saving - requires no preparation
Time saving
20.8
18.8

Uiform contoled
Less or no waste 7.9
No spoilage - can keep in freezer, can keep until
ready to use
1.0

Goes further - more servings from package
1.0

Don't know - no answer
2.0
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { About the same } & 33.7\end{array}$
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 ORDERING PORTIONS FROM SUPPLIERS,
DO ESTABLISHMENTS SPECTFY
THE KIND OF FISH?

Total
Total Users of Portions (59)
q
100.0

Specify kind of fish
75.2

Do not specify kind of fiah
24.8

## Table 31

WOULD THE ESTABLISHMENTS LIKE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION CONTROLLED SEA FOOD ITEMS NOT NOW AVAILABLE?

Total Users of Frozen
Total
(181)
$\not \approx$
100.0

Yes, would like other items
2.9

No, would not like other items 94.9

Don't know
1.9

No answer
.3

Table 32


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


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

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { T19n } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,299 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \＄100，000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | （181） | （52） | （59） | （35） | （35） |
|  | 中 | ¢ | ¢ | 中 | 中 |
|  | $\underline{100.0 *}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Sea food processors | 3.2 | 1.2 | ． 9 | 5.0 | 8.1 |
| Sea food wholesalers | 57.5 | 68.2 | 59.4 | 55.0 | 41.9 |
| Frozen food distributors | 33.5 | 10.6 | 37.8 | 35.0 | 56.5 |
| All otrer，grocery stores， supermarkets | 6.7 | 18.8 | 1.9 | $3 \cdot 3$ | 1.6 |
| No answer | 2.6 | 2.4 | － | 5.0 | 4.8 |

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

## Table 34

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

## According to Location

|  | Total | Out of Central Business District |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (181) | (151) | (30) |
|  | \% | 中 | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 10 miles | 65.2 | 58.3 | 94.9 |
| 10-50 miles | 9.3 | 11.4 | - |
| 51-100 miles | - | - | - |
| More than 100 miles | - | - | - |
| Don't know | 25.2 | 29.9 | 5.1 |
| No answer | . 3 | . 4 |  |

## FREQUENCY OF DELIVERIES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

According to Type of Establishment and Seles Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | （181） | （102） | （79） | （52） | （59） | （35） | （35） |
|  | \％ | 中 | 中 | \％ | 中 | \％ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Every day | 10.5 | 14.8 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 17.8 |
| 2－4 times per week | 19.8 | 27.8 | 3.8 | 10.5 | 14.2 | 25.0 | 37.1 |
| Once a week | 55.3 | 42.6 | 80.8 | 65.9 | 56.6 | 51.7 | 41.9 |
| 2－3times per month | 5.8 | 7.2 | 2.9 | 8.2 | 6.6 | 5.0 | 1.6 |
| Once a month | 4.5 | 3.3 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 4.7 | 5.0 | － |
| Less than once a month | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 6.6 | 1.6 | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer | ． 3 | － 5 | － | － | － | － | 1.6 |

Table 36

CAN SUPPLIERS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IMPROVE SERVICES TO ESTABLISHMENTS?

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000 ~ \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (181) | (52) | (59) | (35) | (35) |
|  | of | \% | \% | \% | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can improve services | 5.8 | 8.2 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 8.1 |
| No, cannot improve services | 93.9 | 91.8 | 95.3 | 98.3 | 90.3 |
| No answer | - 3 | - | - | - | 1.6 |

Table 37

## AMOUNI SPENT FOR FROZRN PROCESSED SEA FOOD DURING PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & \hline 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 100,000$ <br> and <br> Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (181) | (52) | (59) | (35) | (35) |
|  | $\underline{L}$ | 中 | $\underline{\square}$ | $\underline{\square}$ |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$250 | 41.1 | 72.7 | 43.4 | 28.6 | 13.3 |
| \$250-499 | 16.6 | 6.1 | 25.0 | 21.4 | 6.7 |
| \$500-999 | 18.6 | 18.2 | 23.3 | 14.3 | 13.3 |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 9.9 | - | 8.3 | 25.0 | 10.0 |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 6.6 | 3.0 | - | 10.7 | 20.0 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 4.6 | - | - | - | 23.3 6.7 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 1.3 | - | - | - | 6.7 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | - | - | - | - | - |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 1.3 | - | - | - | 6.7 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | - | - | - | - | - |
| \$100,000 and over | - | - | - | - |  |

Table 38

PROFITABILITY TO ESTABLISHMENTS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD AND OTHER HIGH PROTEIN FOODS
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than \$10,000 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \$100,000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (181) | (52) | (59) | (35) | (35) |
|  | d | 中 | ¢ | \% | 中 |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Say sea food more profitable than other high protein foods | 32.3 | 20.0 | 36.7 | $33 \cdot 3$ | 40.4 |
| Say beef more profitable than sea food | 3.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 | $3 \cdot 3$ | - |
| Say all foods the same in profitability | 3.2 | 2.4 | - | - | 12.9 |
| Say meat (unspecified) more profitable than sea food | 2.6 | - | 7.5 | - | - |
| Say chicken more profitable than sea food | 2.2 | 3.5 | - | $3 \cdot 3$ | 3.2 |
| Say miscellaneous other foods more profitable than sea food | 3.5 | 1.2 | 5.7 | - | 6.5 |
| Nonprofit establishments | 28.4 | 44.7 | 25.5 | 21.7 | 17.7 |
| Lon't know | 19.2 | 20.0 | 14.2 | 31.7 | 14.5 |
| No answer | 5.8 | 3.5 | 5.7 | 10.0 | 4.8 |

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

## Table 39

DC THE ESTABLISHMENTS KNOW THEX CAN BUY GOVERMMENT INSPECTES OR GRADED FROZRN PROCESSFD SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishmert

|  | Totai | Pabli: Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Totel Users of Frozer: Processed Sea Food | (181) | (202) | (79) |
|  | \$ | q | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, know they car | 92.3 | 89.5 | 98.1 |
| No, do not know they can | 7.4 | 10.0 | 1.9 |
| No arswer | . 3 | . 5 |  |

## 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 | (166) | (89) | (77) |
|  | \% | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Government inspected foods are safe - pure, fresh, clean, no germs or disease | 55:1 | 42.0 | 78.4 |
| Best quality - use better products, more uniform quality | 40.3 | 53.6 | 16.7 |
| Only type available - it's all inspected, that's what supplier carried | 8.8 | 12.2 | 2.9 |
| Prefer Government inspected - wouldn't buy any other | 4.6 | 6.6 | 1.0 |
| Company demands that it's bought Public demands it | 3.9 1.8 | 3.3 2.8 | 4.9 |
| Easy to handle - easy to serve, ready to cook, portion controlled | 1.4 | 2.2 | - |
| Government/law requires it | 1.1 | 1.7 | - |
| All others | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Don't know, no answer | 1.1 | 1.7 | - |

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

Table 42

HAS GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AFFECTEL T:LE AMOUNT OF FROZEN
PROCFSSED SEA FOOD BOUGTTT EY THF ESTAELISHMENT?
According to Type of Establishment

| Total Users of Government Insuected Froze.. Processe」 See Foot | Total | Public Eatine Places | Institutioras |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (166) | (89: | :17) |
|  | \% | $\underline{4}$ | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Buy more | 4.9 | 6.1 | 2.9 |
| Bry about the same | 92.2 | 90.6 | 95.1 |
| Buy less | - | - | - |
| Don't know | . 4 | - | 1.0 |
| No answer | 2.5 | $3 \cdot 3$ | 1.0 |

Table 43

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

THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY MORE OR LESS?

TABLE 43 HAS BEEN OMITTED AS TOO FEW ESTABLISHMENTS QUALIFIED TO RESPOND.

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 40,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Frocessed Sea Food | (107) | (81) | (26) |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Have served frozen processed sea food before | 9.4* | 7.6 | 15.1 |
| Lacked flavor - own prepared fish has better flavor | 3.6 | 2.4 | 7.5 |
| No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods | 3.1 | 2.4 | 5.7 |
| More expensive than other forms of fish | 2.2 | 1.2 | 5.7 |
| Prefer to serve fresh fish All others | .4 1.3 | .6 1.8 | - |
| Have not served frozen processed sea food before | 90.6* | 92.4 | 84.9 |
| Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not in that business | 42.6 | 44.7 | 35.8 |
| Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, fresh fish available all year | 25.6 | 27.6 | 18.9 |
| Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh, prepare ourselves | 6.3 | 4.1 | 13.2 |
| Unable to nandle preparation - no equipment, not enough room, no time, would need extra help | 4.9 | 4,1 | 7.5 |
| Like taste, freshness of fresh fish - don't trust frozen food, fresh fish tastes better, some frozen is kent too long | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.8 |
| No storwe facilities - no freezer | 1.8 | 2.4 | - |
| Law doesn't allow - don't have license, license costs too much | 1.8 .4 | 2.4 | - |
| All others <br> Don't know, no answer | 5.4 | 4.7 | 7.5 |

*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 FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Pablic |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 40,000-$ 99,000 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10 \mathrm{C}, 000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (288) | (196) | (92) | (101) | (91) | (44) | (52) |
|  | \% | q | $\underline{\text { q }}$ | ¢ | q | $\underline{\chi}$ | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 81.4 | 77.6 | 94.9 | 73.3 | 82.3 | 94.7 | 85.0 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 17.9 | 21.4 | 5.1 | 26.7 | 16.5 | 5.3 | 13.0 |
| No answer | . 7 | 1.0 | - | - | 1.2 | - | 2.0 |
| Average capacity, in cubic feet | 69.1 | 70.5 | 65.1 | 33.8 | 35.4 | 59.6 | 204.3 |

DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOODS? According to Nonusers of Sea Food and Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food

|  | Total | Nonusers of $\qquad$ Sea Food | Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (107) |  |  |
|  | 中 | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 40.8 | 59.2 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 65.9 | 19.7 | 46.2 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 34.1 | 21.1 | 13.0 |

## DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

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

Table a

TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM MEALS SERVED DURING 1957 OR LAST FISCAL YEAR
According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (288) | (196) | (92) |
|  | d | $\underline{\$}$ | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total Receipts $\quad \underline{100.0}$ |  |  |  |
| Less than \$ $\mathbf{1} 0,000$ | 35.6 | 34.2 | 41.0 |
| \$10,000-39,999 | 31.7 | 32.9 | 27.4 |
| \$40,000-99,999 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 15.4 |
| \$100,000 and over | 18.7 | 19.3 | 16.2 |

Table b

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | （288） | （196） | （92） | （101） | （91） | （44） | （52） |
|  | q | \％ | 中 | 中 | 中 | q | \％ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \＄1，000 | 6.8 | 9.8 | 67.3 | 20.7 46.8 | 20.9 | 18.7 |  |
| \＄1，000－2，499 | 27.3 | 9.0 8.6 | 67.3 4.7 | 46.8 | 20.9 11.7 | 18.7 | 12.5 |
| \＄2，500－4，999 | 7.4 7.1 | 8.6 9.0 | 4.7 2.8 | 10.9 10.9 | 11.7 9.1 | 4.2 | － |
| \＄5，000－9，999 | 7.1 9.9 | 12.7 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 22.7 | 8.3 | 2.8 |
| \＄15，000－29，999 | 14.9 | 18.8 | 6.6 | 1.7 | 24.6 | 35.5 | 6.9 |
| \＄30，000－49，999 | 7.9 | 9.0 | 5.6 | ． 9 | 8.2 | 25.0 | 6.9 |
| \＄50，000－99，999 | 8.8 | 11.1 | 3.7 | 3.6 | －9 | 8.3 | 29.2 |
| \＄100，000－249，999 | 7.9 | 9.8 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 1.9 | － | 32.0 9.7 |
| \＄250，000 and over | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.9 |  | － | － | 9.7 |

## Table c

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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Instjtutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (288) | (196) | (92) | (101) | (91) | (44) | (52) |
|  | \& | d | $\pm$ | \% | \& | $\pm$ |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under 5\% for food | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 8.0 | - | - | - |
| 5-14\% | 1.9 | 1.3 | 7.7 | 6.7 | - | - | - |
| 15-24\% | 3.5 | 2.6 | 11.5 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 2.4 | - |
| 25-34\% | 16.7 | 17.2 | 11.5 | 29.3 | 18.3 | - | 10.1 |
| 35-44\% | 24.8 | 26.3 | 11.5 | 16.0 | 19.5 | 26.2 | 42.4 |
| 45-54\% | 27.5 | 28.0 | 23.1 | 16.0 | 26.8 | 38.1 | 35.6 |
| 55-64\% | 12.0 | 11.2 | 19.2 | 6.7 | 14.7 | 23.7 | 6.8 |
| 65-74\% | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 5.1 |
| 75-84\% | 3.5 | 3.9 | - | 6.7 | 2.4 | 4.8 | - |
| 85-94\% | 3.5 | 3.0 | 7.7 | 1.3 | 9.8 | - | - |
| 95-100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Table d

## AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| Total Establishments | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Piaces | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 288 | 196 | 92 | 101 | 91 | 44 | 52 |
| Average Number of Main Meals Served |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midday, weekdays | 206 | 130 | 467 | 134 | 139 | 188 | 480 |
| Sea food meals | 30 | 20 | 63 | 19 | 17 | 26 | 76 |
| Midday, Saturdays and Sundays | 104 | 110 | 88 | 24 | 42 | 80 | 383 |
| Sea food meals | 11 | 14 | ** | 1 | 4 | 10 | 43 |
| Evening, weekdays | 77 | 80 | 65 | 21 | 36 | 65 | 265 |
| Sea food meals | 9 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 28 |
| Evening, Saturdays and Sundays | 89 | 100 | 51 | 22 | 43 | 71 | 308 |
| Sea food meals | 10 | 13 | - | 2 | 5 | 5 | 43 |

** 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 <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (288) | (196) | (92) | (101) | (91) | (44) | (52) |
|  | 中 | \% | ¢ | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Ir a | 13.1 | - | 59.8 | 16.8 | 12.4 | 9.3 | 10.0 |
| \%.55-.49 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 3.4 | 9.4 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 3.0 |
| \$. $50-.74$ | 19.0 | 22.4 | 6.8 | 20.4 | 27.8 | 21.3 | 10.0 |
| \$. $75-.99$ | 30.0 | 37.7 | 1.7 | 25.7 | 41.2 | 26.8 | 21.0 |
| : $010-1.49$ | 9.3 | 11.2 | 2.6 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 21.3 | 21.0 |
| $\therefore$ - $0-1.99$ | 2.4 | 3.1 | - | - | 2.3 | - | 9.0 |
| $\therefore 10-2.49$ | . 7 | 1.0 | - | - | 2.3 | - | - |
| $\cdots-70-2.99$ | 1.3 | 1.7 | - | . 5 | 3.5 | - | - |
| \$3.00-3.99 | 3.0 | 3.8 | - | 6.3 | - | - | 4.0 |
| \$4.00-4.99 | . 7 | 1.0 | - | . 5 | - | - | 3.0 |
| \$5.00 and over | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| No answer | 8.0 | 9.5 | 2.6 | 11.0 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 15.0 |
| Nonprofit establishment | 5.0 | - | 23.1 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 4.0 |

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total establishments | 288 | 101 | 91 | 44 | 52 |
| Average number per establishment | 10 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 30 |

Table $g$

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000 \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total establishments | 288 | 196 | 92 | 101 | 91 | 44 | 52 |
| Average seating capacity, in seats | 149 | 82 | 389 | 132 | 122 | 130 | 245 |

Table h

WHir DAYS OF THE WEEK ON WEICH ESTABLISHMENTS SERVE MEALS According to Thpe of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment <br> Public <br> Eating <br> Places Institutions |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & \hline 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
| - ? Establishments | (288) | (196) | (92) | (101) | (91) | (44) | (52) |
|  | of | d | ¢ | \% | \& | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Serve on 7 lays | 52.4 | 60.1 | 24.8 | 51.4 | 48.2 | $49 \cdot 3$ | 64.0 |
| Serve on 5 days | 25.0 | 30.8 | $4 \cdot 3$ | 23.0 | 28.8 | 28.0 | 20.0 |
| So $E$ on 5 days | 20.9 | 6.9 | 70.9 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 22.7 | 12.0 |
| Serve on less than 5 days | . 9 | 1.2 | - | 2.6 | - | - | - |
| No answer | . 8 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | 4. |

## Table i

PERCENTAGE OF ESTABLISHMENTS SERVING SPECIALIZED TYPES OF FOOD
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (288) | (101) | (91) | (44) | (52) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments with no specialty | 81.5 | 83.2 | 80.6 | 89.3 | 74.0 |
| Establishments with specialty | 18.5* | 16.8 | 19.4 | 10.7 | 26.0 |
| Barbecue | 4.9 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 9.0 |
| Chicken specialty | 4.1 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 4.0 | - |
| Mexican, Spanish | 3.0 | 3.1 | 4.7 | - | 2.0 |
| Steak or chophouse | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.9 | - | 4.0 |
| Sea food | 2.2 | 1.6 | - | - | 9.0 |
| Italian food | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.2 | - | 6.0 |
| Kosher | . 6 | - | - | 4.0 | - |
| Chinese food | . 7 | - | 1.2 | - | 2.0 |
| All others | . 2 | . 5 | - | - | - |

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


