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## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

Almost three quarters of all the establishments in Los Angeles said they bought sea food in the previous twelve months. Among buyers of sea food, a heavy majority said they made purchases of sea food in the frozen processed form.

Thirty-six per cent of all the establishments said they had bought frozen processed fish in November, 1958; 35 per cent sald they had bought frozen processed shellfish; and 20 per cent said they had bought portions.

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

Los Angeles ranked sixth among the ten cities in the survey, 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)

Among purchasers of frozen processed fish, more than a thind bought halibut steaks during November, 1958, 21 per cent bougnt codfish fillets, and 20 per cent bought halibut fillets. Salmon steaks ranked fourth in popularity at 11 per cent.

In terms of pounds bought, halibut fillet was the leading item.

A greater variety of species was bought by Los Angeles establishments than by those of other cities. Twenty-one species were included in Los Angeles purchases.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation and Quality and Condition of Fish (Tables 5, 6)

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

This was generally true for the ten cities included in the survey.
3. Packaging of Fish (Tables 7, 8)

Los Angeles establishments most typically bought frozen processed fish in 5 pound packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Fish Table 9)

Frying was the most popular method of preparing fish among Los Angeles establistments.
The average establishment served 23 per cent
of its fish fried. Frying was the leading method in all ten cities of the study.

Broiling and baking were also common methods of preparation in Los Angeles. The average establishment served 24 per cent broiled and 18 per cent, baked.
C. Frozen Processed Shellfish - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Species and Type of Preprep-

More thail a third of the establishments using shellfish bought frozen raw shrimp in November, 1958, while almost the same number bought breaded shrimp.

A substantial number of establishments bought shrimp deheaded and raw in the shell. Raw scallops were another popular purchase.

Raw shrimp and breaded shrimp were both bought widely and in large quantities in all of the other cities included in the study.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation; Toward Quality and Condition of Shellfish
(Tables 12, 13)
All but a few purchasers were satisfied with the present prepreparation of shellfish, and with the quality and condition of the shellfish which they bought.

The same held generally true for the other cities in the survey.
3. Packaging of Shellfist (Tables 14, 15)

Most lpading shellfish items were bought in 5 pound packages in Los Angeles.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Shellfish (Table 16)

Frying was the most popular way of preparing shellfish in Los Angeles. The typical establishment served two thirds of its shellfish fried.

As with fisk, frying was the leading method of preparing shellfish in all ten cities of the study.
D. Portion Controlled Sea Food - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: $\because$ Type of Prepreparation (Tables 1, 17, 18, 19)

One fifth of all the establishments in Los Angeles bought portions during November, 1958.

Los Angeles ranked fourth among ten cities, in percentage of establishments buying portions.

In Los Angeles, portions were most of ten bought uncooked-breaded or uncooked-plain.

Almost two thirds of the purchasers of portions said that they were currently buying about the same amount of portions as the year before. Nineteen per cent said they were buying more, and 8 per cent said they were buying less.
2. Attitudes Toward Portions (Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, 24)

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

About a fifth of the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was better than that of other frozen processed fish. Almost three fourths rated the quality as about the same, while 1 per cent considered the quality poorer.

Major advantages cited for portions included:

| \% of <br> Users <br> Citing |
| :--- |
| 49 |
| 36 |
| 30 |
| 22 |

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

Forty per cent of the users of portions thought their customers liked portions better than other types of frozen processed fish, while another 41 per cent thought customers liked them about the same. Fewer than 3 per cent said that their customers liked portions less than other types of frozen processed sea food.
3. Peckaging of Portions 'Tables 25, 26)

Los Argeles purchasers tended to buy portions in packages of about the same size as those preferred by purchasers in other cities. The average weight of a package of portions for the city was 5.4 pounds.

They also tended to buy individuel portions of average size. The average weight of an individual portion was 4.6 ounces.

Almost all establishments, in Los Angeles 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 Los Angeles, with 75 per cent of the establishments serving them this way. The average establishment served 63 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.

In Los Angeles, the average establishment served 21 per cent baked.

Four fifths of the Los Angeles establishments using portions cooked them while frozen.
5. Cost of Using Portions (Table 29)

Only 15 per cent of the establishments using portions said they were more expensive than other forms of frozen processed fish. A
large majority of users considered them less expensive, or rated them about the same.
6. Miscellaneous Findings About Portions (Tables 30, 31)

Five sixths of the Los Angeles purchasers said they specified the kind of fish when ordering portions.

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

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

Price also figured as a reason for not buying portions in Atlanta, Denver, and Portland. It was less important as a reason in the other six cities of the survey.
E. Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food
(Tables 33, 34, 35, 36)
Establishments in Los Angeles tended to buy frozen processed sea food from both frozen food distributors and sea food wholesalers. Most of the suppliers were within 50 miles of the establishment, and deliveries were usually made once a week. Most establishments were sati.sfied with the services of the suppliers.

Frozen food distributors supplied 49 per cent of the establishments, while sea food wholesalers accounted
for another 42 per cent. come of the smaller establishments used such suppliers as supermarkets and groceries.

Los Angeles suppliers were often located furtber from the establishments than was the case in other cities. Fifty-two per cent of the suppliers were within ten miles of the establishment, while anotber 45 per cent were between ten and 50 miles away.

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

Only a small fraction of the purchasers said they could think of ways in which the suppliers could improve their services.
F. Expenditures for Frozen Processed Sea Food; Its Profitability (Tables 37, 38)

More than a third of the establishments reporting in Los Angeles said that they spent less than $\$ 250$ for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twelve months. The highest figure reported fell between $\$ 50,000$ and $\$ 99,999$. Other establishments were between these two extremes, with the median coming at $\$ 472$.

Five eighths of the 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 Fond - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes (Tables 39, 40, 41, 42)

Four fifths of the establishments in Los Angeles were dware 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 bry tore sea food if Government inspected sea food were available. Most said they would buy about the 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, 5 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 Los Angeles said they had never bought frozen processed sea food, with the main reason given being that they sold little or no fish.

Findings regarding cold storage facilities among nonusers in Los Angeles may be summarized as follows:qTotal Nonusers of FrozenProcessed Sea Food 100
Have cold storage facilities ..... 71
Don't use sea food at all ..... 43
Use sea food, but not frozen processed sea food ..... 34
No cold storage facilities ..... 23

## DETAILED FINDINGS

Table 1

## did the establishment buy sea food in the preceding twelve months?

## According to Thpe of Establishment and Sales Volume



## Table 2

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

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Restaurants | Schools， Plants | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hospitals, } \\ \text { Welfare } \\ \text { Establishments } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Less } \\ \text { Than } \\ \$ 10,000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | （424） | （291） | （55） | （34） | （44） | （119） | （147） | （81） | （77） |
|  | 中 | 中的 | 中 | q | 中 | 中 | 中 | \％ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. |
| Yes，bought frozen processed sea food | 75.2 | 75.7 | 80.0 | 76.5 | 62.9 | 59.9 | 75.4 | 88.7 | 69 |
| No，aid not buy frozen processed sea food | 24.8 | 24.3 | 20.0 | 23.5 | 37.1 | 40.1 | 24.6 | 11.3 | 10.6 |

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (204) | (38) | (74) | (45) | (47) |
|  | 中 | q | \% | 中 | \% |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\frac{\text { Barracuda }}{\text { Raw }}$ | . 6 | - | 1.6 | - | - |
| $\frac{C o d}{B r e a d e d ~}^{\text {Col }}$ | 1.6 | - | 4.0 | - | - |
| Fillets | 20.9 | 13.2 | 29.0 | 8.1 | 26.3 |
| Steaks | 3.5 | 8.8 | . 8 | 6.5 | - |
| Breaded steaks | 1.3 | - | 1.6 | 3.2 | - |
| Chunk | 1.0 | - | 1.6 |  | 1.8 |
| Raw | 1.0 | - | 1.6 | - | 1.8 |
| Dover Sole |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |
| Raw | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.8 |
| $\frac{\text { Fiorida Butterfish }}{\text { Kaw }}$ | . 6 | - | - | 3.2 | - |
| $F=\frac{\text { under }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 9.3 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 6.5 | 19.3 |
| Raw | . 6 | 2.9 | - | - | , |

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

Table 3
(Contd.)

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

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | q | 中 | \% | 中 |
| Haddock |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 7.7 | 2.9 | 10.5 | 6.5 | 8.8 |
| Steaks | 1.3 | 1.5 | . 8 | 3.2 | - |
| Breaded steaks | 1.0 | - | . 8 | 3.2 | - |
| Raw | . 3 | - | - | 3.2 | 1.8 |
| Halibut |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 19.9 | 8.8 | 19.4 | 22.6 | 31.6 |
| Steaks | 34.7 | 45.6 | 32.3 | 40.3 | 21.1 |
| Breaded steaks | 2.6 | - | 3.2 | 6.5 | - |
| Fletch | 2.9 | 5.9 | , | 3.2 | 5.3 |
| Chunk | 1.6 | ) | - | 3.2 | 5.3 |
| Raw | 4.8 | - | 2.4 | 3.2 | 17.5 |
| Lake Perch |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 1.3 | 2.9 | - | - | 3.5 |
| Mahi Mahi |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steaks | . 6 | - | - | - | 3.5 |
| Chunk | .6 | - | - | - | 3.5 |
| Octan Perck |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | . 3 | - | - | - | 2.8 |
| Fiilets | 1.6 | - | 2.4 | 3.2 | - |
| Raw | .6 | - | - | 3.2 | - |
| I ike |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fille s | . 3 | - | - | 1.6 | - |

Table 3
（Contd．）

FROZEN FROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER， 1958 －HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE
（Continued）
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than \＄10，000 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \％ | q | 中 | \％ | 中 |
| Pompano |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | ． 6 | － | － | － | 3.5 |
| Pleces | ． 3 | － | － | － | 1.8 |
| Raw | ． 3 | － | － | － | 1.8 |
| Red Snapper |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 2.5 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Chunk | ． 6 | － | － |  | 3.5 |
| Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 5.8 | 2.9 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 10.5 |
| Steaks | 10.6 | 13.2 | 8.1 | 11.3 | 12.3 |
| Chunk | 1.0 | － | － | － | 5.3 |
| Raw | 1.9 | － | 1.6 | － | 7.0 |
| Sand－dat |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filiets | ． 3 | － | － | － | 1.8 |
| ス2w | ． 3 | － | － | － | 1.8 |
| Se．Bass |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fille ${ }^{+s}$ | 3.2 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 8.8 |
| こteqk： | 2.3 | － | 1.6 | － | 8.8 |
| Kı ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | 2.3 | － | 1.6 | － | 1.8 |

Table 3

## (Contd.)

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39.999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,990 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | \% | $\%$ |
| Sole |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | . 6 | - | - | 3.2 | - |
| Fillets | 6.4 | - | 5.6 | 12.9 | 8.8 |
| Heads off | . 3 | - |  | 12.9 | 1.8 |
| Pieces | . 3 | - | - | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Raw | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.8 |
| Sturgeon |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.8 |
| Swordfish |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 5.1 | - | 4.0 | 4.8 | 14.0 |
| Steaks | 8.0 | 10.3 | 4.8 | 8.1 | 12.3 |
| Breaded steaks | . 3 | 1.5 | - | - | - |
| Chunk. | 1.6 | - | - | 1.6 | 7.0 |
| Raw | . 6 | - | :. 6 | - | 7.0 |
| Trout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ireaded | . 3 | - | - | 2.6 | - |
| -iblets | 2.C | - | - | - | c, ; |
| スам | 5.1 | 7.4 | 3.2 | 6.5 | 5. |
| Wh tefist |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filie | . 6 | - | - | - | 3.5 |

## Table 4

QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISR BCUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

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

Table 4

QUANTTTY OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  |  | Average Number of Pounds |  |  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Pounds | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ | User Establishments |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { User } \\ \text { Establishmenta } \end{gathered}$ |
| Pompano |  |  |  | Sole |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 300 | (b) | 150.0 | Breaded | 30 | (a) | 15.0 |
| Pleces | 60 | (b) | 60.0 | Fillets | 1,177 | 1.3 | 58.9 |
| Raw | (a) | - | - | Heads off | 20 | (a) | 20.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Pieces | 5 | (a) | 5.0 |
| Red Snapper |  |  |  | Raw | 15 | (a) | 15.0 |
| Fillets | 96 | (b) | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Chunk | 600 | . 7 | 300.0 | $\frac{\text { Sturgeon }}{\text { Slices }}$ | 50 | (b) | 50.0 |
| Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finlets | 1,096 | 1.3 | 60.9 | Swordfish |  |  |  |
| Steaks | 1,534 | 1.8 | 46.5 | Fillet ${ }_{\text {c }}$ | 750 | . 9 | 46.9 |
| Chunk | 900 | 1.0 | 300.0 | Steaks | 2,772 | 3.2 | 110.9 |
| Raw | 3,775 | 4.3 | 629.2 | Breaded steaks | 2 | (a) | 2.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Chunk | 1,527 | 1.7 | 305.4 |
| Sand-dab |  |  |  | Raw | 4 | (a) | 2.0 |
| Fillets | 800 | . 9 | 800.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | (a) | - | - | Trout |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Breaded | 100 | (b) | 100.0 |
| Sea Bass |  |  |  | Fillets | 630 | . 8 | 210.0 |
| Fillets | 590 | P 7 | 59.0 | Raw | 731 | . 8 | 46.2 |
| Steaks | 285 | (b) | 40.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 110 | (b) | 36.7 | $\frac{\text { Whitefish }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 100 | (b) | 50.0 |

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

|  | Total Users |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2}$ |  |  |
| Total Purchases of Cod | 100.0 |  | Total |
| Prefer more prepreparation of cod | - |  | Users (1) |
| Prefer less prepreparation of cod | - |  | $\underline{8}$ |
| Prefer prepreparation as it isNo answer | 97.8 |  |  |
|  | 2.2 | Total Purchases of Sea Bass | 100.0 |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of sea bass | - |
|  |  | Prefer less prepreparation of sea bass | - |
| Total Purchases of Flounder | 100.0 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 100.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of flounder | - |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of flounder | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 96.8 | Total Purchases of Sole | 1 c |
| No answer | 3.2 |  |  |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of sole |  |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 88.0 |
| Total Purchases of Haddock | 1000 | No answer | 12.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of haddock | - |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of haddock | - |  |  |
| Frefer prepreparation as it is | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Swordfish | 100.0 |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of swordfish Prefer less prepreparation of swordfish Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer | - |
| Total Purchases of Hall int | 100.0 |  | 8 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of halibut Prefer less prepreparation of halibut, Prefer prepreparation as it is No answer | 1.4 |  | 10.2 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 96.3 |  |  |
|  | 96.2 |  |  |
|  | 2.4 | Total Purchases of Trout | 100.0 |
| No answer |  | Prefer more prepreparation of trout | - |
|  | 100.0 | Prefer less prepreparation of trout | - |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 90.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of salmon | 1.7 | No answer | 10.0 |
| Prefer Jess prepreparntion of salmon | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 95.0 |  |  |
| No answer | 3.3 |  |  |

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

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

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

Table 6

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION
OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

Total Users of Frozen Processed
Fisb, November, 1958

Isfled

No answer

Table 7

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

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% |  | 中 |
| Total Purchasers of Cod Fillets | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Haddock Fillets | 100.0 |
| 1 pound packages | 13.9 | 1 pound packages | 4.2 |
| 5 pound packages | 80.0 | 4 pound packages | 4.2 |
| 10 pound packages | 1.5 | 5 pound packages | 70.8 |
| 15 pound packages | 3.1 | 10 pound packages | 16.6 |
| 50 pound packages and over | 1.5 | 15 pound packages | 4.2 |
| Average number of servings per pound | 3.5 | Average number of servings per pound | 3.2 |
| Total Purchasers of Flounder Fillets | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Halibut Fillets | 100.0 |
| 5 pound packages <br> 10 pound packages <br> 50 pound packages and over <br> No answer | 89.5 | 1 pound packages | 8.1 |
|  | 3.5 | 3 pound packages | 1.6 |
|  | 3.5 | 5 pound packages | 64.6 |
|  | 3.5 | 7 pound packages | 4.8 |
|  |  | 10 pound packages | 11.3 |
| Average number of servings per pound |  | 15 pound packages | 1.6 |
|  | 3.2 | 20 pound packages | 3.2 |
|  |  | 25 pound packages | 1.6 |
|  |  | 50 pound packages and over | 3.2 |
|  |  | Average number of servings per pound | 2.7 |

(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 date 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.

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

|  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | d |  |  |
| Total Purchasers of Hallbut Steaks | 100.0 |  | Total |
| 1 pound packages | 7.4 |  | \% |
| 2 pound packages | 1.9 |  |  |
| 3 pound packages | 3.7 72.2 | Total Purchasers of Swordfish Steaks | 100.0 |
| 5 pound packages | 72.2 |  | $\underline{ }$ |
| 7 pound packages | 3.7 |  | 8.0 |
| 10 pound packages | 4.6 | Packages 5 pound packages | 68.0 |
| 12 pound packages | 2.8 | 7 pound packages | 4.0 |
| 15 pound packages | 1.9 | 7 pound packages | 4.0 |
| 25 pound packages | . 9 | 10 pound packages | 4.0 |
| 50 pound packages and over | . 9 | 15 pound packages | 4.0 |
|  |  | 25 pound packages | 4.0 |
| Average number of servings per pound |  | 50 pound packages and over | 8.0 |
|  | 2.6 |  |  |
|  |  | Average number of servings per pound | 2.1 |
| Total Purchasers of |  |  |  |
|  | 6.1 | Total Purchasers of Sole - Fillets | 100.0 |
| 5 pound packages | 57.5 |  |  |
| 7 pound packages | 12.2 | 1 pound packages | 10.0 |
| 8 pound packages | 3.0 | 3 pound packages | 5.0 |
| 10 pound packages | 12.2 | 5 pound packages | 70.0 |
| 25 pound packages | 3.0 | 10 pound packages | 10.0 |
| 38 pound packages | 3.0 | 50 pound packages and over | 5.0 |
| 50 pound packages and over | 3.0 |  |  |
| Average number of servings per pound | 2.9 |  |  |

(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 date 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
PROCESSED FISE PACKAGES

| Total Users of Frozen Processed <br> Fish, November, 1958 | (204) |
| :--- | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| Satisfled | 94.8 |
| Dissatisfied | 2.9 |
| No answer | 2.3 |

Table 9

PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH SERVED FRIED, BROIIED, BAKED 2 AND IN OIHER WAYS

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 100,000$ <br> and <br> Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (204) | (38) | (74) | (45) | (47) |
|  | \% | o | ¢ | ¢ | \% |
|  | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  | 38.2 | 36.3 | 25.8 | 14.0 |
| None fried $1-14 \%$ | 30.5 | 38.2 | 36. 3 | 25.8 | 14.0 |
| 15-34\% | 4.2 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 10.5 |
| 35-64\% | 16.1 | 5.9 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 33.3 |
| 65-84\% | 2.9 | - | 2.4 | 8.1 | 1.8 |
| Over 84\% | 43.4 | 44.1 | 43.6 | 48.4 | 36.9 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 2.9 | 7.4 | . 8 | 1.6 | 3.5 |
| Average percentage served | 52.8 | 48.4 | 50.3 | 59.3 | 56.4 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 62.4 | 60.3 | 64.5 | 66.1 | 56.1 |
| 1-14\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15-34\% | 5.1 | $\cdots$ | 3.2 | 8.1 | 12.3 |
| 35-64\% | 9.6 | 8.8 | 10.5 | 3.2 | 15.8 |
| 65-84\% | 5.5 | 5.9 | $7 \cdot 3$ | 1.6 | 5.3 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 14.5 | 17.6 | 13.7 | 19.4 | 7.0 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 2.9 | 7.4 | . 8 | 1.6 | 3.5 |
| Average percentage served | 24.2 | 27.1 | 24.3 | 23.0 | 22.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 63.1 | 63.2 | 65.3 | 69.4 | 50.8 |
| 1-14\% | 4.2 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 10.5 |
| 15-34\% | 9.3 | 8.8 | 8.1 | 6.5 | 15.8 |
| 35-64\% | 9.6 | 2.9 | 8.1 | 14.5 | 15.8 |
| 65-84\% | . 6 | - | - | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Over 84\% | 10.3 | 16.2 | 15.3 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 2.9 | 7.4 | . 8 | 1.6 | 3.5 |
| Average percentsge served | 17.9 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 12.0 | 16.0 |
| Establishments Ser ing in Other Ways |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other : 3 ys | 96.5 | 92.6 | 99.2 | 98.4 | 92.9 |
| 1-14\% | - 3 | - | ~ | - | 1.8 |
| 15-34\% | - 3 | - | - | - | 1.8 |
| 35-64\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| Over 84\% | - | - | - | 1. 6 | - |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 2.9 | 7.4 | . 8 | 1.6 | $3 \cdot 5$ |
| Average percentage served | . 1 | - | - | - | . 6 |

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | 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 Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | (206) | (337) | (59) | (57) | (57) |
|  | 中 | \% | \$ | \% | \% |
|  | $\underline{100.0 *}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Abalone |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 3 | - | - | - | - |
| Breaded | . 3 | 1.8 | - | - | - |
| Fillets | . 3 | - | - | 1.2 | - |
| Steaks | . 3 | - | - | 1.2 | - |
| Clams |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Canned | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean | 1.0 | - | - | - | 4.3 |
| Crabs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 3.0 | - | 2.1 | 1.2 | 8.7 |
| Crab legs | 1.6 | - | - | - | 7.2 |
| Whole frozen uncooked | $3 \cdot 3$ | - | - | 1.2 | 13.0 |
| Canned | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | 5.2 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 13.0 |
| Lobster |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 5.9 | 5.3 | 2.1 | 4.8 | 13.0 |
| Breaded | . 3 | - | - | 1.2 | - |
| Cooked lobster meat | . 7 | - | 2.1 | - | , |
| Block frozen lobster meat | 1.3 | - | 2.1 | - | 2.9 |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | 7.9 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 17.4 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 6.6 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 7.2 | 13.0 |

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

Table 10
(Contd.)
$\frac{\text { FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, } 1958 \text { - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE }}{\text { (Continued) }}$
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 最 | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Oysters |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Breaded | 1.3 | - | - | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| Canned | . 3 | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean | 5.2 | - | - | 7.2 | 24.5 |
| Scallops |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 1.3 | - | - | 2.4 | - |
| Breaded | 2.3 | 1.8 | - | 6.0 | - |
| In block | . 3 | - | - | - | - |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 21.6 | - | 14.6 | 22.9 | - |
| Shrimp |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 8.5 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 9.6 | - |
| Breaded | 34.8 | 49.1 | 47.9 | 26.5 | - |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.6 | - | 3.1 | 1.2 | - |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 14.8 | 12.3 | 8.3 | 15.7 | - |
| Deheaded and shelled | . 7 | - | 1.0 |  | - |
| Broken pieces | 2.3 | 7.0 | - | - | - |
| Shrimp cocktail in jar | . 3 | - | - | i.? | - |
| Raw; clean dehead: d, shelled and deveined | 37.0 | 28.1 | 32.3 | 47.0 | - |


|  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All | User |
|  |  | Establishments | Establishments |
| Abalone 50 (b) 50 |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 50 | (b) | 50.0 |
| Breaded | 15 | (a) | 15.0 |
| Fillets | 20 | (a) | 20.0 |
| Steaks | 20 | (a) | 20.0 |
| Clams 50 |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 50 | (b) | 50.0 |
| Canned | (a) | - | 7 |
| Raw; clean | 242 | (b) | 80.7 |
| Crabs 9150 |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 815 | . 9 | 91.0 |
| Crab legs | 2,375 | 2.7 | 475.0 |
| Whole frozen uncooked | 3,560 | 4.1 | 356.0 |
| Canned | (a) | - | - |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | 4,467 | 5.1 | 279.2 |
| Lobster ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 977 | 1.1 | 54.3 |
| Breaded | 25 | (a) | 25.0 |
| Cooked lobster meat | 50 | (b) | 25.0 |
| Block frozen lobster meat | 93 | (b) | 23.3 |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | 7,867 | 2.1 | 327.8 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 4,556 | 5.2 | 227.8 |
| (a) Purchases were not reported in quantities |  |  |  |
| (b) Les | half a |  |  |

Table 11
(Contd.)

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

|  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All | User |
|  |  | Establishments | Establishme |
| Oysters |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 25 | (a) | 25.0 |
| Breaded | 142 | (b) | 35.5 |
| Canned | (a) | - | - |
| Raw; clean | 477 | . 5 | 29.8 |
| Scallops |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 270 | (b) | 67.5 |
| Breaded | 199 | (b) | 28.4 |
| In block | 200 | (b) | 200.0 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 4,739 | 5.4 | 71.8 |
| Shrimp |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 3,986 | 4.6 | 153.3 |
| Breaded | 4,561 | 5.2 | 43.0 |
| Cooked and breaded | 1,055 | 1.2 | 211.0 |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 11,700 | 13.4 | 260.0 |
| Deheaded and shelled | 525 | . 6 | 262.5 |
| Broken pieces | 2,160 | 2.5 | 308.6 |
| Shrimp cocktail in jar | 40 | (a) | 40.0 |
| Raw; clean, deheaded, shelled and deveined | 18,646 | 21.3 | 165.0 |

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

|  | Total Users <br> (1) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchases of Crabs | $\begin{gathered} \text { \& } \\ 100.0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Total Users $\qquad$ |
| Prefer more prepreparation of crabs | - |  | q |
| Prefer less prepreparation of crabs | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 95.1 | Total Purchases of Scallops | 100.0 |
| No answer | 4.9 |  |  |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of scallops |  |
|  |  | Prefer less prepreparation of scallops | - |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | $9 \% .7$ |
| Total Purchases of Lobster | 100.0 | No answer | 1. 3 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of lobster | - |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of lobster | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 98.6 | Total Purchases of Shrimp | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| No answer | 1.4 |  |  |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of shrimp | 2.0 |
|  |  | Prefer less prepreparation of shrimp | . 3 |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 97.4 |
| Total Purchases of Oysters | 100.0 | No answer | - 3 |

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

Many establishments bought more than one species. Some establishments also bought a species prepared in two different ways. For example, shrimp breaded and shrimp cooked. This was counted as two purchases of the species.

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

## Table 13

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

## WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION OF

## FROZFN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

Total Users of Frozen Processed

Shellfish, November, 1958 $\quad$| (206) |
| :---: |


(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 shellfish, preprepared in one manner.

Table 14
(Contd.)

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

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | q |  | 中 |
| Total Purchasers of Scallops - Raw | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of $\qquad$ | 100.0 |
| 1 pound packages | 4.6 | 1 pound packages | 1.9 |
| 3 pound packages | 9.1 | 2 pound packages | . 9 |
| 5 pound packages | 80.3 | 3 pound packages | 3.8 |
| 15 pound packages | 3.0 | 5 pound packages | 91.5 |
| 20 pound packages | 3.0 | 10 pound packages | 1.9 |
| Average number of servings per pound | 3.4 | Average number of servings per pound | 3.1 |
| Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Cooked | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw | 100.0 |
|  |  | 2 pound packages | 1.8 |
| 1 pound packages <br> 3 pound packages <br> 5 pound packages | 7.7 | 3 pound packages | 2.7 |
|  | 3.9 | 5 pound packages | 89.3 |
|  | 88.4 | 10 pound packages | 4.4 |
|  |  | 20 pound packages | 1.8 |
|  |  | Average number of servings per pound | 3.8 |

(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 shellfish, preprepared in one manner

Table 15

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

WTTH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN
PROCESSED SHELLFISH FACKAGES

Satisfied

Dissatisfied

Table 16

PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELTFISH SERVED FRIED，BROIIED，BAKED，AND IN OTHER WAYS According to Sales Volume

|  |  | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 100,000$ and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Processed Shellfish | （206） | （33） | （59） | （57） | （57） |
|  | 中 | 中 | 中 | ¢ | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  |  |  |  |  |
| None fried | 9.5 | 28.0 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 5.8 |
| 1－14\％ | 4.3 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 8.7 |
| 15－34\％ | 7.2 | 8.8 | 3.1 | 7.2 | 11.6 |
| 35－64\％ | 10.5 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 13.3 | 23.2 |
| 65－84\％ | 12.1 | － | 9.4 | 14.5 | 23.2 |
| Over 84\％ | 52.5 | 52.6 | 70.9 | 54.2 | 24.6 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 3.9 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.9 |
| Average percentage served | 67.2 | 55.5 | 77.5 | 72.0 | 56.6 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 81.0 | 82.4 | 84.4 | 79.6 | ＂6．9 |
| 1－14\％ | 2.3 | － | 1.0 | 4.8 | 2.9 |
| 15－34\％ | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 2.4 | 10.1 |
| 35－64\％ | 4.6 | － | 1.0 | 9.6 | 7.2 |
| 65－84\％ | － | － | － | － | － |
| Over $84 \%$ | 2.6 | 5.3 | 5.2 | － | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 3.9 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.9 |
| Average percentage served | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 6.5 |

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

| Total Users of Frozen | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Processed Shellfish | （206） | （33） | （59） | （57） | （57） |
|  | 中 | 中 | \％ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 87.6 | 91.2 | 92.8 | 88.0 | 76.9 |
| 1－14\％ | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 | － | 4.3 |
| 15－34\％ | 5.3 | － | 2.1 | 6.0 | 13.0 |
| 35－64\％ | 1.6 | － | 1.0 | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| 65－84\％ | － | － | － | － | － |
| Over $84 \%$ | － | － | － | － | － |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 3.9 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.9 |
| Average percentage served | 2.3 | ． 1 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 5.1 |
| Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 64.2 | 57.8 | 81.3 | 63.9 | 46.4 |
| 1－14\％ | 2.0 | － | － | 6.0 | 1.4 |
| 15－34\％ | 10.2 | 3.5 | 7.3 | 10.9 | 18.9 |
| 35－64\％ | 4.9 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 8.7 |
| 65－84\％ | 4.3 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 5.8 |
| Over 84\％ | 10.5 | 24.6 | 2.1 | 6.0 | 15.9 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 3.9 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.9 |
| Average percentage served | 18.6 | 30.4 | 7.8 | 14.9 | 28.9 |

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 mid－ point of the interval，and taking an average of all the cases．

TYPES OF PORTIONS BOUGHT NOVEMBER, 1958
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Then } \\ & \$ 40,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) | (82) | (35) | (67) | (50) |
|  | 中 | \& | ¢ | \& | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Cooked - breaded | 13.5 | 4.0 | 34.0 | 17.6 | 7.1 |
| Cooked - plain | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Uncooked - breaded | 62.1 | 74.8 | 34.0 | 63.8 | 59.7 |
| Uncooked - plain | 32.0 | 30.9 | 34.0 | 27.8 | 38.3 |

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

## Table 18

QUANTITY OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total <br>  <br> Cooked - breaded |  | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Counds |  |  |  |  |

## 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 Eating Places | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) | (82) | (35) | (67) | (50) |
|  | \% | ¢ | \% | \% | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Use more now | 18.5 | 22.1 | 10.7 | 15.0 | 24.0 |
| Use about the same | 64.0 | 59.8 | 73.2 | 62.6 | 66.2 |
| Use less now | 7.9 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 11.2 | 2.8 |
| Don't know | 7.9 | 7.4 | 8.9 | 11.2 | 2.8 |
| No answer | 1.7 | 2.5 | - | - | 4.2 |

QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS

Total
Total Purchases of Types of Portions, November, 1958

Satisfied
Dissatisfied

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

 FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) |
|  | 中 |
|  | 100.0 |
| Say portions better | 20.2* |
| Ease of preparation - saves time, labor | 3.4 |
| Quality | 2.8 |
| Attractive - eye appealing | 2.2 |
| Taste better - tasty, like the flavor | 1.7 |
| Uniform controlled serving - always same amount | 1.1 |
| Firmer, don't break | 1.1 |
| Just like them better - brand I buy is better | 1.1 |
| Customers order, seem to like them - more demand | . 6 |
| Don't know - no answer | 9.0 |
| Portions poorer | 1.1 |
| Not as tasty - poor flavpr, flat | 1.1 |
| About the same | 71.9 |
| Don't know | 5.1 |
| No answer | 1.7 |

*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

Fast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare
Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor, already prepared
size of portions - uniform, controlled

Can control food cost better - know profit
No bones
Customers like them
Quality
4.5

五
Attractive, eye appealing $\quad 1.1$
All others .6
No advantages 1.1
Don't know, no answer 2.8

DISADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS
Table 23

Total Users of Portions

Not economical - more expensive to buy
Break too easily
Lack flavor - not as tasty, sometimes dry
Cannot be frozen - deteriorate rapidly when thawed
Portions wrong size - too small
Not enough demand - customers do not order
All others
No disadvantages 62.9
Don't know, no answer
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the tatal because of more than one reply to a question.

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) |
|  | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 |
| Think customers like portions better | 39.9* |
| Customers order - seem to like them | 11.2 |
| Uniform controlled servings - always the same amount | 10.1 |
| Economical | 5.0 |
| No bones - safer for children | 4.5 |
| Attractive - eye appealing | 4.5 |
| Good quality - choice fish | 2.8 |
| Faster quicker to serve - no waiting | 1.7 |
| All others | 3.9 |
| Don't know - no answer | 5.6 |
| Think customers like portions less | 2.8 |
| Lack flavor - not as tasty | . 6 |
| Customers don't order - ask for them | . 6 |
| Portions too small | . 6 |
| Don't know - no answer | 1.0 |
| Think customers like portions about the same | 41.0 |
| Don't know | 13.5 |
| No answer | 2.8 |

* 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
Average weight of package of portions, in pounds
Average number of servings per package
Average weight of individual servings, in ounces

Average weight of individual portions, in ounces

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.

SATISFACTION WITR THE SIZE OF PORTIONS IN A PACKAGE

Total Users of Portions
Table 26

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 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 40,000 \end{aligned}$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (217) | (82) | (35) | (67) | (50) |
|  | \$ | \% | q8 | \% | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried 60.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| None fried | 24.8 | 8.2 | 60.6 | 26.1 | 22.5 |
| 1-14\% | 2.2 | 1.6 | 3.6 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| 15-34\% | 1.1 | - | 3.6 | 1.9 | - |
| 35-64\% | 8.4 | 10.7 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 14.1 |
| 65-84\% | 2.8 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 4.2 |
| Over 84\% | 60.7 | 76.2 | 26.8 | 63.5 | 56.4 |
| Average percentage served | 62.8 | 78.4 | 29.0 | 63.1 | 62.4 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  |  |  |  |  |
| None brofled | 87.6 | 87.7 | 87.4 | 94.5 | 77.5 |
| 1-14\% | . 6 | - | 1.8 | . 9 | - |
| 15-34\% | 3.9 | 4.9 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 5.7 |
| 35-64\% | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.6 | - | 7.0 |
| 65-84\% | 1.7 | . 8 | 3.6 | . 9 | 2.8 |
| Over 84\% | 3.4 | 4.1 | 1.8 | . 9 | 7.0 |
| Average percentage served | 6.8 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 13.5 |

Table 27
(Contd.)

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$40,000 | Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) | (82) | (35) | (67) | (50) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 71.4 | 86.8 | 37.5 | 68.2 | 76.1 |
| 1-14\% | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.8 | - | 5.7 |
| 15-34\% | 2.8 | 4.1 | - | 1.9 | 4.2 |
| 35-64\% | 4.5 | 3.3 | 7.1 | 2.8 | 7.0 |
| 65-84\% | 1.1 | . 8 | 1.8 | 1.9 | - |
| Over 84\% | 18.0 | 2.5 | 51.8 | 25.2 | 7.0 |
| Average percentage served | 20.5 | 5.7 | 52.9 | 26.6 | 11.5 |
| Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 97.8 | 98.4 | 96.4 | 96.3 | 100.0 |
| 1-14\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15-34\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 35-64\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| Over 84\% | 2.2 | 1.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | - |
| Average percentage served | 2.1 | 1.5 | $3 \cdot 3$ | $3 \cdot 5$ | - |

## Table 28

DO ESTABLISHMENTS COOK PORTIONS WHILE STILL FROZEN?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{gathered} \text { Than } \\ \$ 40,000 \end{gathered}$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) | (82) | (35) | (67) | (50) |
|  | q | q | \& | $\underline{q}$ | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, cook while frozen | 79.8 | 77.9 | 83.9 | 86.0 | 70.4 |
| No, do not cook while frozen | 16.8 | 18.8 | 12.5 | 14.0 | 21.1 |
| No answer | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.6 | - | 8.5 |


|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (117) |
|  | \% |
|  | 100.0 |
| Say portions more expensive | 14.6 |
| Price includes processing and packaging - prepreparation would tend to raise cost | 4.5 |
| Cost is more for amount of serving | 2.2 |
| All others | 1.7 |
| Don't know - no answer | 6.2 |
| Portions less expensive | 41.6* |
| Less or no waste | 27.0 |
| Labor saving - requires no preparation | 7.9 |
| Time saving | 6.7 |
| Uniform controlled servings | 2.8 |
| Goes further - more servings from package | 1.1 |
| All others | 1.1 |
| Don't know - no answer | 3.9 |
| About the same | 33.7 |
| Don't know | 8.4 |
| No answer | 1.7 |

*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 SPECIFY THE KIND OF FISH？
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| Total Users of Portions | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Less | \＄40，000 |
|  |  | Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Than \＄40，000 | and Over |
|  | （117） | （82） | （35） | （67） | （50） |
|  | \％ | \％ | 中 | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Specify kind of fish | 82.6 | 82.0 | 83.9 | 82.2 | 83.1 |
| Do not specify kind of fish | 15.7 | 15.6 | 16.1 | 17.8 | 12.7 |
| No answer | 1.7 | 2.4 | － | － | 4.2 |

Table 31

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

| tal Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
|  | (311) | (241) | (70) | (172) | (139) |
|  | \% | \% | 中 | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, would like other items | 2.5 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 3.8 |
| No, would not like other items | 86.5 | 87.8 | 82.4 | 87.5 | 84.9 |
| Don't know | 5.1 | 3.1 | 11.4 | $7 \cdot 3$ | 1.6 |
| No answer | 5.9 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 9.7 |

## Table 32

Total Establishments Using Frozen Processed Total

Sell, serve little or no fish - no demand, calls for it
Serve other types - perch, shrimp, halibut, etc., other types more popular
Too expensive - cheape: to use frest fish, cheaper to prepare ourselves
Size of portions - prefer to sut own portions, want larger portions, get more with other kinds
Prefer to prepare own - rather bread my own, do not like way It must be cooked, prefer own methods
Don't like them so wouldn't serve them
Quality not as good - doesn't meet our quality standards, can't tell what is in it
No particular reason - just didn't
Use fresh fish - prefer fresh fish
Didn't know it was available
Dislike flavor - fresh fish has more flavor, no taste
to portion controlled sea foods
to portion controlled sea food know what we will hand Company makes the rules - policy against it

All others
Don't know, no answer 3.1

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{q} \tag{194}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\underline{100.0^{*}}
$$

29.5
24.1
3.4
1.4
1.0
. 7
4


## WAS PRICE A REASOK ESTARLISHMENTS

 DID NOT BUY PORTIONS:$\qquad$

Total Nonusers Who Dic Not Vollunteer Paine as a Fieasor
Yes, frice was a reason ..... $\leqslant 0$
No, price was not a reasor: ..... 86.1
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 ESTABLISHMENTS

## 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 Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (311) | (65) | (107) | (71) | (68) |
|  | \% | \% | 中 | 是 | 2 |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Sea food processors | . 8 | - | - | - | 4.8 |
| Sea food wholesalers | 41.6 | 29.6 | 41.3 | 48.0 | 51.2 |
| Frozen food distributors | 49.3 | 45.2 | 49.4 | 51.0 | 52.4 |
| All other, grocery stores, supermarkets | 11.0 | 25.2 | 8.1 | 2.0 | 8.3 |
| No answer | . 8 | - | 2.3 | - | - |

* 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 | (311) | (293) |
|  | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 10 miles | 52.0 | 48.6 |
| 10-50 miles | 44.8 | 48.0 |
| $51-100$ miles | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| More than 100 miles | . 4 | . 5 |
| Don't know | 1.5 | 1.6 |

** Includes 18 establishments in the central business district which would be statistically misleading to show separately.

## Table 35

## FREQUENCY OF DELIVERIES OF FROZEN FROCESSED SEA FOOD

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (311) | (241) | (70) | (65) | (107) | (71) | (68) |
|  | \% | \% | 中 | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 170.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Every day | 8.5 | $9 \cdot 7$ | 4.4 | - | 2.9 | 7.8 | 32.1 |
| 2-4 times per week | 23.5 | 28.7 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 21.5 | 40.2 | 27.4 |
| Once a week | 45.7 | 42.9 | 54.4 | 48.7 | 54.6 | 40.2 | 29.8 |
| 2-3 times per month | 12.0 | 11.4 | 14.0 | 17.4 | 13.4 | 7.8 | 7.1 |
| Once a month | 6.1 | 4.5 | 11.4 | 15.6 | 4.1 | 4.0 | - |
| Less than once a month | 4.0 | 2.8 | 7.9 | 9.6 | 2.9 | - | 3.6 |
| Don't know, no answer | . 2 | - | . 9 | - | .6 | - | - |

Table 36

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (311) | (65) | (107) | (71) | (68) |
|  | ¢ | 中 | 中 | \$ | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can improve services | 5.3 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 7.1 |
| No, cannot improve services | 92.4 | 88.7 | 93.6 | 95.1 | 91.7 |
| Don't know | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | - | 1.2 |
| No answer | 1.3 | 3.5 | 1.2 | - | - |

## Table 37

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen _ Processed Sea Food | (317) | (65) | (107) | (71) | (68) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$250 | 35.9 | 71.6 | 41.6 | 19.3 | 1.3 |
| \$250-499 | 15.8 | 12.5 | 20.2 | 15.9 | 10.7 |
| \$500-999 | 16.5 | 12.5 | 15.6 | 29.6 | 8.0 |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 13.8 | 2.3 | 14.9 | 19.3 | 18.7 |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 7.1 | 11.4 | 17.3 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 4.0 | . | . 6 | 3.4 | 16.0 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 1.2 | - | - | - | 6.7 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 2.5 | - | - | 1.1 | 12.0 |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 1.0 | - | - | - | 5.3 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | . 7 | - | - | - | 4.0 |
| \$100,000 and over | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 38

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen <br> Processed Sea Food | （311） | （65） | （107） | （71） | （68） |
|  | \＄ | 中 | ¢ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100．0＊ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Say sea food more profitable than other high protein foods | 36.8 | 23.3 | 44.4 | $37 \cdot 3$ | 39.3 |
| Say meat（unspecified）more profitable than sea food | 7.2 | 6.9 | 8.8 | 6.9 | 4.8 |
| Say beef more profitable than sea food | 1.9 | － | 2.3 | 2.0 | 3.6 |
| Say eggs more profitable than sea food | 1.3 | － | 1.8 | 2.9 | － |
| Say pork more profitable then sea food | ． 6 | 2.6 | － | － | － |
| Say all foods the same in profitability | ． 6 | ． 9 | 1.2 | － | － |
| Say miscelleneous other foods more profitable than sea food | 18.0 | 17.2 | 21.1 | 16.7 | 14.3 |
| Nonprofit establishments | 19.0 | 33.6 | 11.1 | 14.7 | 20.2 |
| Don＇t know | 16.7 | 20.7 | 14.6 | 20.6 | 10.7 |
| No answer | 5.5 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 5.9 | 11.9 |

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

## Table 39

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS KNOW THEY CAN BUY GOVERNMENT
INGPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Potal Users of Frozen <br> Processed Seaz Food | (311) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Table 40

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR
GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Type of Establishment

| Total Establishments Knowing Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (248) | (187) | (61) |
|  | q | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, do buy | 95.8 | 95.4 | 97.0 |
| No, do not buy | 2.9 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| No answer | 1.3 | 1.8 |  |


|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchasers of Government Inspected or Graded Sea Food | (237) | (178) | (59) |
|  | 中 | \% | ¢ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Best quelity - use better products, more uniform quelity | 41.8 | 46.7 | 28.1 |
| Only type available - it's all inspected, that's what supplier carries | 21.9 | 22.6 | 19.8 |
| Government inspected foods are safe - pure, fresh, clean, no germs or disease | 16.9 | 17.0 | 16.7 |
| Prefer Government inspected - wouldn't buy any other | 7.9 | 6.7 | 11.5 |
| Company demands that it's bought | 4.6 | 1.1 | 14.6 |
| More economical | 2.2 | 3.0 | - |
| Public demands it | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.0 |
| Easy to handle - easy to serve, ready to cook, portion controlled | 1.4 | - 7 | 3.1 |
| All others | 7.9 | 8.1 | 7.3 |
| Don't know, no answer | 3.6 | 4.4 | 1.0 |

*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 ESTABLISIIMENT?

According to Type of Establishment

| Total Users of Government Inspected Frozen Processed Sea Food | Total | Public |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eating <br> Places | Institutions |
|  | (237) | (178) | (59) |
|  | q | \% |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| more | 4.6 | 5.2 | 3.1 |
| about the same | 78.7 | 78.2 | 80.2 |
| less | 1.4 | 1.1 | 2.1 |
| 't know | 11.7 | 10.7 | 14.6 |
| answer | 3.6 | 4.8 | - |

## Table 43

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

THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY MORE OR LESS?

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

Say they would buy more
Say they would buy less
About the same

Don't know

No answer

## Table 44

PREVIOUS USE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD BY NONUSERS AND REASONS FOR STOPPING USE OR FOR NEVER USING

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (286) | (163) | (86) | (37) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Have served frozen processed sea food before | 8.2* | 6.0 | 9.2 | 17.4 |
| No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods | 4.0 | 2.6 | 7.5 | 2.2 |
| Prefer to serve fresh fish | 1.5 | . 9 | 1.7 | 4.3 |
| More expensive than other forms of fish | 1.0 | . 9 | - | 4.3 |
| Lacked flavor - own prepared fish has better flavor | . 7 | - | - | 6.5 |
| Unable to handle preparation - didn't have the help | - 7 | - | 2.5 |  |
| No storage | . 7 | . 9 | - | 2.2 |
| All others | . 5 | . 9 | - | - |
| Have not served frozen processed sea food before | 91.8* | 94.0 | 90.8 | 82.6 |
| Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not in that business | 61.3 | 66.4 | 55.0 | 52.2 |
| Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, fresh fish available all year | 15.5 | 10.2 | 25.0 | 17.4 |
| No storage facilities - no freezer | 12.2 | 16.2 | 5.8 | 8.7 |
| Unable to handle preparation - no equipment, not enough room, no time, would need extra help | 2.2 | 2.1 | 3.3 | - |
| Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh, prepare ourselves | 2.0 | 3.0 | . 8 | - |
| Like taste, fre-hness of fresh fish - don't trust frozen food, s'esh fish tastes better, some frozen is kept too long | 1.2 | . 9 | 2.5 | - |
| ```Law doesn't allow - don't have license, license costs too much``` | 1.0 | 1.7 | 17 | 6.5 |
| Don't know, no answer | 2.7 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 6.5 |

*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


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

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nonusers } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sea Food } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Users Not <br> Using <br> Frozen <br> Processed <br> Sea Food |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (286) |  |  |
|  | ¢ | 中 | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 61.1 | 38.9 |
| Yes, bave cold storage facilities | 77.3 | 43.1 | 34.2 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 22.7 | 18.0 | 4.7 |

## 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 Establishments

|  | Total | Public Restaurents | Schools, Plants | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hospitals, } \\ \text { Welfare } \\ \text { Establishments } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | All <br> Others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (597) | (419) | (60) | (38) | (80) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | 中 | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total Receipts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 40.1 | 37.6 | 44.9 | 18.4 | 56.5 |
| \$10,000-39,999 | 33.3 | 35.4 | 30.0 | 31.6 | 25.9 |
| \$40,000-99,999 | 14.9 | 16.1 | 11.7 | 23.7 | 8.3 |
| \$100,000 and over | 11.7 | 10.9 | 13.4 | 26.3 | 9.3 |

## Table b

## AMOUNT EATABLISHMENTS SPENT FOR FOOD DURING PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTKS

According to Type of Establishwent and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Restaurants | Scbools, Plants | Hospitals, <br> Welfare <br> Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (597) | (419) | (60) | (38) | (80) | (228) | (193) | (93) | (83) |
|  | \& | q | $\pm$ | \$ | q | ¢ | \% | ¢ | 者 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$1,000 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 | - | 3.1 | 5.0 | . 7 | - 5 | - |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 14.6 | 15.3 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 27.9 | 29.7 | 7.3 | 2.5 | - |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 22.2 | 25.2 | 8.9 | 16.7 | 21.7 | 42.6 | 13.9 | 1.6 | 2.2 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 19.2 | 16.7 | 35.8 | 13.8 | 16.5 | 15.8 | 35.3 | 4.3 11.9 | 2.2 3.3 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 12.4 | 10.1 | 28.5 | 16.7 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 24.3 | 11.9 | 3.3 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 12.0 | 11.2 | 12.5 | 16.7 | 14.5 | 1.9 | 16.0 | 32.2 | 8.8 |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 8.1 | 10.0 | 1.8 | 13.8 | 3.1 | - | 1.8 | 38.1 | 16.5 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 5.1 | - | . 7 | 9.4 | 25.2 |
| \$100,000-249,999 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 1.0 | - | - | - | 29.7 |
| \$250,000 and over | 1.4 | 1.4 | - | 5.6 | 1.0 | - | - | - | 12.1 |

Table c

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OPERATING COST SFENT FOR FOOD IN PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS

## According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less } \\ \text { Then } \\ \$ 10,000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (597) | (419) | (60) | (38) | (80) | (228) | (193) | (93) | (83) |
|  | \& | 2 | 2 | \% | \$ | ¢ | \& | क | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under 5\% for food | . 1 | - | - | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | 1.1 |
| 5-14\% | 1.5 | 1.2 | - | 9.7 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.5 | . 9 | - |
| 15-24\% | 1.5 | 1.1 | - | 6.5 | 3.9 | . 7 | 2.9 | 1.7 | - |
| 25-34\% | 5.4 | 6.0 | 2.3 | 9.7 | 3.0 | 7.6 | 3.6 | 5.2 | $3 \cdot 3$ |
| 35-44\% | 38.8 | 37.0 | 58.2 | 22.6 | 37.6 | 32.3 | 35.2 | 46.1 | 62.3 |
| 45-54\% | 43.5 | 46.5 | 27.9 | 38.6 | 41.6 | 43.9 | 52.4 | 35.7 | 25.6 |
| 55-64\% | 4.6 | 3.6 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 7.9 | 6.3 | 2.6 | 6.1 | 3.3 |
| 65-74\% | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 2.0 | $3 \cdot 3$ | 1.8 | . 9 | 1.1 |
| 75-84\% | 1.8 | 2.1 | - | - | 2.0 | 3.6 | - | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| 85-94\% | - 3 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.2 |
| 95-100\% | - 3 | - | 2.3 | - | - | - | - | 1.7 | - |

AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

## According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,949 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | 597 | 419 | 60 | 38 | 80 | 288 | 193 | 23 | 83 |
| Average Number of Main Meals Served |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midday, weekdays | 114 | 86 | 225 | 198 | 118 | 42 | 79 | 152 | 411 |
| Sea food meals | 13 | 7 | 22 | 69 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 64 |
| Midday, Saturdays and Sundays | 61 | 58 | 33 | 136 | 81 | 14 | 32 | 82 | 276 |
| Sea food meals | 5 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 17 |
| Evening, weekdays | 70 | 70 | 65 | 172 | 33 | 18 | 35 | 92 | 316 |
| Sea food meals | 7 | 7 | 5 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 36 |
| Evening, Saturdays and Sundays | 56 | 66 | 11 | 132 | 20 | 9 | 23 | 91 | 264 |
| Sea food meals | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | , | 1 | , | 8 | 27 |

Table e

## AVERAGE PRICE PER MEAL SERVED

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Totel | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools， Plants | Hospitals， Welfare Estaiblishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishnents | （597） | （419） | （60） | （38） | （80） | （228） | （193） | （93） | （83） |
|  | 中 | 中 | \＆ | q | 中 | \＄ | 中 | 中 | \％ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Under \＄． 25 | － | － | － | － | － | ${ }^{-}$ | － | － | － |
| \＄． 25 －． 49 | 10.0 | 4.3 | 31.7 | 10.5 | 17.6 | 14.5 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 7.8 |
| \＄． $50-.74$ | 23.7 | 23.0 | 11.7 | 26.3 | 39.9 | 35.3 | 21.3 | 8.5 | 9.8 |
| \＄．75－．99 | 25.1 | 31.1 | 3.3 | 5.3 | 23.1 | 21.7 | 34.8 | 23.8 | 11.8 |
| \＄1．00－1．49 | 17.0 | 23.0 | － | 2.6 | 7.4 | 12.3 | 21.3 | 23.8 | 12.7 |
| \＄1．50－1．99 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 23.2 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 5.5 | 14.7 | 14.7 |
| \＄2．00－2．49 | 3.2 | 4.4 | － | － | －9 | ． 9 | 1.7 | 7.7 | 9.8 |
| \＄2．50－2．99 | 1.8 | 2.1 | － | － | 2.8 | － | 1.0 | 4.6 | 6.9 |
| \＄3．00－3．99 | 1.4 | 1.8 | － | － | ． 9 | － | － | 3.8 | 6.9 |
| \＄4．00－4．99 | ． 5 | ． 7 | － | － | － | － | $\cdot 3$ | － | 2.9 |
| \＄5．00 and over | ． 8 | 1.2 | － | － | － | － | ． 7 | － | 4.9 |
| No answer | 1.8 | 1.2 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 1.0 | ． 8 | 2.0 |
| Nonprofit establishment | 8.4 | － | 48.3 | 39.5 | － | 11.1 | 4.5 | 8.5 | 9.8 |

## Table

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$100,000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total establishments | 597 | 288 | 193 | 93 | 83 |
| Average number per establishment | 9 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 46 |

Table g

## SEATING CAPACITY OF ESTABLISBMENTS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total establishments | 597 | 419 | 60 | 38 | 80 | 288 | 193 | 93 | 83 |
| Average seating capacity, in seats | 82 | 64 | 176 | 183 | 45 | 36 | 58 | 102 | 283 |

## Table h

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

According to Type of Establishmerit and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools， Plants | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hospitals, } \\ & \text { Welfare } \\ & \text { Establif shments } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishmente | （597） | （429） | （60） | （38） | （80） | （228） | （293） | （93） | （83） |
|  | d | 中 | 2 | 中 | q | 中 | 中 | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Serve on 7 days | 36.4 | 39.3 | 8.3 | 92.1 | 31.5 | 24.5 | 29.9 | 60.0 | 65.7 |
| Serve on 6 days | 35.6 | 41.6 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 50.9 | 38.2 | 43.0 | 26.2 | 17.6 |
| Serve on 5 days | 27.6 | 18.4 | 90.0 | $5 \cdot 3$ | 17.6 | 36.2 | 27.1 | 13.8 | 16.7 |
| Serve on less than 5 days | ． 3 | ． 5 | － | － | － | ． 8 | － | － | － |
| No answer | ． 1 | ． 2 | － | － | － | － 3 | － | － | － |

Table i

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

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (597) | (228) | (193) | (93) | (83) |
|  | \% | 中 | \% | \% | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments with no specialty | 75.1 | 72.7 | 74.6 | 63.8 | 81.4 |
| Establishments with specialty | 24.9* | 22.3 | 25.4 | 36.2 | 18.6 |
| Mexican, Spanish | 6.5 | 9.1 | 6.9 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Steak or chophouse | 4.5 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 12.3 | 6.9 |
| Italian food | 3.5 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 2.0 |
| Chinese food | 3.3 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 6.2 | 1.0 |
| Kosher | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Barbecue | 1.5 | . 9 | 3.4 | - | - |
| Sea food | 1.3 | . 9 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| Chicken specialty | 1.1 | . 3 | . 3 | 6.2 | - |
| French food | . 1 | - | - | - | 1.0 |
| All others | 1.1 | 1.7 | . 7 | - | 2.0 |

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

