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## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

All but 5 per cent of the establishments in Springfield said they bought sea food in the previous twelve months. Among buyers of sea food, somewhat more than half said they made purchases of sea food in the frozen processed form.

Twenty per cent of all the establishments said they had bought frozen processed fish in November, 1958; 33 per cent said they had bought frozen processed shellfish; and 25 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.

Springfield ranked seventh among the ten cities of 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)

Almost half of the users of frozen processed fish bought haddock fillets during November, 1958. This was also the leading item in Springfield, in terms of total quantity purchased.

Swordfish steaks and halibut steaks were bought by many establishments in Springfield.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation and Quality and Condition of Fish (Tables 5, 6)

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

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

Data on packaging of fish in Springfield are limited. Haddock fillets, the most popular purchases, were most of ten bought in five pound packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Fish (Table 9)

Frying was the most popular method of preparing fish among Springfield establishments. The average establishment served 42 per cent of its fish fried. Frying was the leading method in all ten cities of the study.

Broiling and to a lesser extent baking were also common methods of preparation in Springfield. The average establishment served 38 per cent broiled and 15 per cent baked.
C. Frozen Processed Shellfish - Purchases, Attitudes and Practices

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

Almost one third of the users of shellfish in Springfield bought frozen raw lobster in November, 1958. A large number of estabiishments bought raw shrimp, and raw scallops were also widely purchased. These three items were also leaders, in terms of total quantities purchased.

Frozen raw lobster was frequently bought in Atlanta and Omaha. Frozen raw shrimp and breaded shrimp were leading shellfish items in all cities of the survey.
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 Shellfish (Tables 14, 15)

Deta on shellfish packaging in Springfield are limited. Frozen raw shrimp was most often bought in 5 pound packages, while frozen raw lobster was purchased in smaller packages.
4. Method of Preparing and Serving Shellfish (Table 16)

Frying was the most popular way of preparing shellfish in Springfield. The typical establishment served 59 per cent of its shellfish fried.

As with fish, 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 - Type of Prepreparation (Tables 1, 17, 18, 19)

One fourth of all the establishments in Springfield bought portions during November, 1958.

Springfield ranked third among ten cities, in percentage of establishments buying portions.

In Springfield, portions were most widely bought, cooked and breaded; and the quantity purchased was greater than that of any other type of prepreparation.

More than half of the Springfield purchasers said they were currently buying more portions than the year before. Thirty-three per cent said they were buying about the same amount, while 7 per cent said they were buying less.

This trend towards an increasing use of portions was not so strong in most of the other ten cities. The trend was also notable in Denver.
2. Attitudes Toward Portions (Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 )

All of the purchasers interviewed said they were satisfied with the quality and condition of portions.

Four per cent of the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was better than that of other frozen processed fish. Another

4 per cent considered the quality poorer, while
the great majority rated the quality as about the same.

Major advantages cited for portions included:

|  | $\%$ of <br> Users <br> Citing |
| :--- | :---: |
| Convenience, ease of preparation | 73 |
| Size of portions, uniform portions | 64 |
| Fast, timesaving | 24 |

Many purchasers in the Springfield schools specified one disadvantage to portions, that they did not contain the correct proportion of protein.

Users of portions generally thought their customers liked portions as well as other types of frozen processed fish. Fewer than 2 per cent said that their customers liked portions less than other types of frozen processed sea food.
3. Packaging of Portions (Tables 25, 26)

Springfield furchasers tended to buy portions in packages of about the same size as those preferred by purchasers in other cities. The average wejght of a package of portions for the city was 5.0 pounds.

However, they tended to buy individual portions of smaller size. The average weight of an individual portion was 2.3 ounces.

Almost all establishments, in Springfield and the other nine cities, said they were satisfied with the size of portions in the packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Portions (Tab1es 27, 28)

Baking was the most widely used method of preparing and serving portions in Springfield. The average establishment served 50 per cent of its portions baked.

Frying was the leading method in all other cities of the study. In Springfield, the average establishment served 37 per cent of its portions fried.

Five sixths of the Springfield establishments using portions cooked them while frozen.
5. Cost of Using Portions (Table 29)

Over half of the establishments using portions said they were more expensive than other forms of frozen processed fish. Twenty-two per cent of the users considered them less expensive.
6. Miscellaneous Findings about Portions (Tables 30, 31)

Three fifths of the Springfield establishments said they specified the kind of fish when ordering portions.

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

Establishments which used frozen processed sea food, but not portions, gave a number of reasons for not
buying portions: they used fresh fish, they served other types of fish, they sold comparatively little fish.
E. Suppliers of Frozen Frocessed Sea Food
Tables $33,34,35,36$ )

Establishments in Springfield tended to buy frozen processed sea food from sea food wholesalers, usually less than ten miles away, to have it delivered once a week, and to be satisfied with the services of the suppliers.

Sea food wholesalers supplied 52 per cent of the establishments, while frozen food distributors accounted for anotber 45 per cent.

Main suppliers were located less than 10 miles from the establishment, in 72 per cent of the cases. In 7 per cent of the cases, the suppliers were between 10 and 50 miles from the establishment, while in 17 per cent of the cases, the suppliers were between 51 and 100 miles away.

In almost three quarters of the cases, deliveries were made once a week.

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

Almost half of the establishments reporting in
Springfield said that they spent less than $\$ 250$ for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twelve months. The highest figure reported fell between $\$ 5,000$ and $\$ 9,999$. Other establishments were between these two extremes, with the median coming at $\$ 280$.

One third 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 Food - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes

## (Tables 39, 40, 41, 42)

Three fourths of the establishments in Springfield were aware that they could buy frozen processed sea food, which had been inspected or graded by the United States Government.

Most of those who were unaware said they would buy about the same amount of sea food, if Government inspected sea food were available.

All of the establishments interviewed in Springiield, who were aware that they could buy Government inspected or graded sea food, said tha' they 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 as a Factor
(Tables $43,44,45$ )

Most nonusers in Springfield said they had never bought frozen processed sea food. About a third said they used fresh fish, while another third said they used little or no fish.

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

Total Nomusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food
Have cold storage facilities
Don't use sea food at all

No cold storage facilities

## DETAILED FINDINGS

## Table 1

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

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 40,000$ <br> and <br> Over |
| Total Establishments | (196) | (143) | (53) | (72) | (73) | (S1) |
|  | q | \& | 中 | \$ | q | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought sea food | 95.0 | 94.0 | 98.1 | 88.0 | 98.8 | 100.0 |
| Bought frozen processed sea food | 52.5 | 45.8 | 73.6 | 43.4 | 53.8 | 63.8 |
| Bought frozen processed fish | 20.4 | 22.6 | 13.2 | 10.8 | 16.3 | 39.7 |
| Bought frozen processed shellfish | 32.6 | 37.5 | 17.0 | 22.9 | 27.5 | 53.4 |
| Bought portions | 24.9 | 13.1 | 62.3 | 24.1 | 30.0 | 19.0 |
| No, did not buy sea food | 5.0 | 6.0 | 1.9 | 12.0 | 1.2 | - |

Table 2

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | （186） | （134） | （52） | （63） | （72） | （51） |
|  | q8 | 中 | q | 中 | 中 | \＄ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes，bought frozen processed sea food | 55.2 | 48.7 | 75.0 | 49.3 | 54.4 | 63.8 |
| No，did not buy frozen sea food | 44.8 | 51.3 | 25.0 | 50.7 | 45.6 | 36.2 |

Table 3

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

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

## QUANTTTY OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOIJGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958


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

## Table 5

## SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Users (1) |  | Users $(1)$ |
|  | ¢ |  | q |
| Total Purchases of Hadidock | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Swordfish | 100.0 |
| eparation of haddock | - | Prefer more prepreparation of swordfish | - |
| eparation of haddock | - | Prefer less prepreparation of swordfish | - |
| ion as it is | $93.5$ | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 100.0 |

(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 counted as two purchases of 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 QUALITTY AND CONDITION
OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

## Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish, November, 1958

## PACKAGE SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

## BOUGET IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE

```
    NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1)
```

Total q

|  | Total Purchasers of Haddock Fillets | 100.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Packages less than | pound | 4.8 |
| 1 pound packages |  | 4.8 |
| 2 pound packages |  | 4.8 |
| 3 pound packages |  | 4.8 |
| 5 pound packages |  | 52.3 |
| 10 pound packages |  | 14.2 |
| 20 pound packages |  | 4.8 |
| No answer |  | 9.5 |

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

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

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

## Table 8

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION: WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN

PROCESSED FISH PACKAGES

## Total Users of Frozer Processed <br> Fish, November, 1958

Table 9

## PERCENTAGF OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OIHER WAYS

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (40) | Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (40) |
|  | ¢ |  | 中 |
|  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  | Establishraents Serving Baked |  |
| None fried | 35.6 | None baked | 68.9 |
| 1-14\% | 2.2 | 1-14\% | - |
| 15-34\% | 2.2 | 15-34\% | 4.4 |
| 35-64\% | 22.2 | 35-64\% | 8.9 |
| 65-84\% | 2.2 | 65-84\% | 2.2 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 26.7 | Over 84\% | 6.7 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.9 | Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.9 |
| Average percentage served | 41.7 | Average percentage served | 14.6 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  | Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |
| None broiled | 44.4 | None in other ways | 91.1 |
| 1-14\% | - | 1-14\% | - |
| 15-34\% | 2.2 | 15-34\% | - |
| 35-64\% | 15.6 | 35-64\% | - |
| 65-84\% | - | 65-84\% | - |
| Over 84\% | 28.9 | Over $84 \%$ | - |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.9 | Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.9 |
| Average percentage served | 38.4 | Average percentage served | - |


|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | (61) |
|  |  |
|  | 100.0* |
| Clams |  |
| Breaded | 15.3 |
| Raw; clean | 5.6 |
| Crabs |  |
| Cooked | 1.4 |
| Whole frozen uncooked | 1.4 |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | 1.4 |
| Lobster |  |
| Cooked | 4.2 |
| Cooked lobster meat | 2.8 |
| Tails, cleaned and deheaded | 1.4 |
| Canned | 1.4 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 30.6 |
| Oysters |  |
| Raw; clean | 1.4 |
| Scallops |  |
| Breaded | 19.4 |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 26.4 |
| Shrimp |  |
| Breaded | 19.4 |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean, deheaded, shelled and deveined | 27.8 |

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

|  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All | User |
|  |  | Establishments | Establishments |
| Clams |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 146 | . 7 | 13.3 |
| Raw; clean | 56 | (b) | 14.0 |
| Crabs |  |  |  |
| Cooked | (a) | - | - |
| Whole frozen uncooked | 72 | (b) | 72.0 |
| Crab meat - shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | (a) | - | - |
| Lobster |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 108 | . 5 | 36.0 |
| Cooked lobster meat | (a) | - | - |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | (a) | - | - |
| Canned | (a) | - | - |
| Raw; whole, clean | 2,512 | 11.4 | 114.2 |
| Oysters |  |  |  |
| Raw; clean | (a) | - | - |
| Scallops |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 312 | 1.4 | 22.3 |
| Cooked and breaded | 5 | (a) | 5.0 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 4.005 | 18.1 | 210.8 |
| Shrimp |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 301 | 1.4 | 21.5 |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 85 | (b) | 85.0 |
| Raw; clean. deheaded, shelled and deveined | 3,938 | 17.8 | 196.9 |

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

|  | Total Users (1) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchases of Lobster | $q$ <br> 100.0 |  | Tot al Users (1) |
| Prefer more prepreparation of lobster | - |  | ¢ |
| Prefer less prepreparation of lobster | 93. |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 93.1 | Total Purchases of Shrimp | 100.0 |
| No answer | 6.9 |  | - |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of shrimp <br> Prefer less prepreparation of shrimp | - |
|  |  | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 97.1 |
| Total Purchases of Scallops | 100.0 | No answer | 2.9 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of scallops | 2.9 |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of scallops | - |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 91.2 |  |  |
| No enswer | 5.9 |  |  |

(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.

SARISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH QUALITTY AND CONDITION OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHETLFTSH

Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish, November, 1958

Total

Satisfied
Dissatisfied

Don't know

No answer

|  |  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | q |  | d |
| Total | Total Purchasers of Lobster - Raw | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw | $\underline{100.0}$ |
|  |  |  | 2 pound packages | 5.0 |
| (61) | Packages less than 1 pound | 36.3 | 3 pound packages |  |
|  |  | 40.9 | 4 pound packages | 10.0 |
| q |  | 4.6 | 5 pound packages | 55.0 |
|  | 15 pound packages | 4.6 | 7 pound packages | 5.0 |
| 100.0 | No answer | 13.6 | 15 pound packages | 5.0 |

(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

Total Usere of Frozer
Processed Shelletst

## Total

## Sarisfied

Dissatisfied

Don't know

Table 16

PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH SERVED FRIED, BROIIED, BAKED, AND IN OITHRR WAYS

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellifish | (61) | Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | (61) |
|  | q |  |  |
|  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  | Establishments Serving Baked |  |
| None fried | 22.2 | None baked | 80.6 |
| 1-14\% | - | 1-14\% |  |
| 15-34\% | 5.6 | 15-34\% | 6.9 |
| 35-64\% | 11.1 | 35-64\% |  |
| 65-84\% | 9.7 | 65-84\% | 1.4 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 43.1 | Over 84\% | 2.8 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.3 | Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.3 |
| Average percentage served | 58.6 | Average percentage served | 5.8 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  | Estahlishments Serving in Other Ways |  |
| None broiled | 68.0 | None in other ways | 70.8 |
| 1-14\% | 1.4 | 1-14\% | - |
| 15-34\% | 5.6 | 15-34\% | 2.8 |
| 35-64\% | 13.9 | 35-64\% | 2.8 |
| 65-84\% |  | 65-84\% | 1.4 |
| Over 84\% | 2.8 | Over 84\% | 13.9 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.3 | Don't know, no answer, refused | 8.3 |
| Average percentage served | 11.9 | Average percentage served | 17.3 |

Note: Percentages, other than average percentages, are based on total estahlishments 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 ${ }_{2} 1958$

| Total Users of Portions | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | (53) |
|  | \$ |
|  | 100.0 |
| Cooked - breaded | 72.7 |
| Cooked - plain | - |
| Uncooked - breaded | 12.7 |
| Uncooked - plain | 14.6 |


|  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All Establishments | User Establishments |
| Cooked - breaded | 4,364 | 19.7 | 109.1 |
| Cooked - plain | - | - | - |
| Uncooked - breaded | 2,652 | 12.0 | 378.8 |
| Uncooked - plain | 3,370 | 15.2 | 421.3 |

Table 19

AMOUNT OF PORTIONS BOUGHT BY
ESTABLISHMENTS, AS COMPARED
TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR
Total Users of Portions
100.0

Use more now 56.4
Use about the same 32.7
Use less now $7 \cdot 3$

Don't know 3.6

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH

QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS

|  | Total <br> Total Purchases of Types of <br> Portions, November, 1958 |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | $(53)$ |
|  | $\underline{q}$ |
|  | 100.0 |
| Satisfied | 100.0 |
| Dissatisfied | - |

Total
(53)

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

Table 21

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

FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (53) |
|  | q2 |
|  | 100.0 |
| Say portions better | 3.6 |
| Uniform controlled serving - always same amount | 1.8 |
| Don't know - no answer | 1.8 |
| Portions poorer | 3.6 |
| Poor quality - inferior quality, can't tell what is in them | 1.8 |
|  | 1.8 |
| About the same | 80.1 |
| don't know | 9.1 |
| No answer | 3.6 |

## Table 22

## ADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

## Total

Convenience, easy of preparation - save labor,
already prepared 72.7

Size of portions - uniform, controlled
servings, the right size serving63.6
Fast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare ..... 23.6
Economical - no waste ..... 7.3
Can control food cost better - know profit ..... 3.6

Don't know, no answer

* 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

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (53) |
|  | 中 |
|  | 100.0 |
| Not correct protein proportion | 41.8** |
| Not economical - more expensive to buy | 1.8 |
| No disadvantages | 20.0 |
| Don't know, no answer | 36.4 |

Total
20.0
** This percentage represents interviews taken in one school system.

## Table 24

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

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (53) |
|  | 中 |
|  | 100.0 |
| Think customers like portions better | 12.7* |
| Uniform controlled servings - always the same amount | 5.5 |
| Customers order - seem to like them | 1.8 |
| Faster quicker to serve - no waiting | 1.8 |
| Taste better - like flavor | 1.8 |
| Don't know - no answer | 5.5 |
| Think customers like portions less | 1.8 |
| Portions too small | 1.8 |
| Think customers like portions about the same | 34.6 |
| Don't know | 47.3 |
| No answer | 3.6 |

*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 | 53 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Average weight of package of portions, in pounds | 5.0 |
| Average number of servings per package | 20.2 |
| Average weight of individual servings, in ounces | 4.0 |
| Average weight of individual portions, in ounces | 2.3 |

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 Users of Portions

Table 27

## PERCENTAGE OF PORTIONS SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (53) | Total Users of Portions | (53) |
|  | \% |  | q |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ |  | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  | Establishments Serving Baked |  |
| None fried | 55.4 | None baked | 45.5 |
| 1-14\% | - | 1-14\% | - |
| 15-34\% | - | 15-34\% | - |
| 35-64\% | 7.3 | 35-64\% | 1.8 |
| 65-84\% | - | 65-84\% | - |
| Over 84\% | 36.3 | Over $84 \%$ | 52.7 |
| Average percentage served | 37.2 | Average percentage served | 49.7 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  | Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |
| None broiled | 90.9 | None in other ways | 100.0 |
| 1-14\% | - | 1-14\% | - |
| 15-34\% | - | 15-34\% | - |
| 35-64\% | 5.5 | 35-64\% | - |
| 65-84\% | - | 65-84\% | - |
| Over 84\% | 3.6 | Over 84\% | - |
| Average percentage served | 6.1 | Average percentage served | - |

Table 28

DO ESTABLISHMENTS COOK PORTIONS
WHILE STILL FROZEN?

| WHILE STILL FROZEN? |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |
| Total Users of Portions | (53) |
|  | 中 |
|  | 100.0 |
| Yes, cook while frozen | 83.6 |
| No, do not cook while frozen | 16.4 |

AND REASONS WHY PORTIONS ARE THOUGHT MORE OR LESS EXPENSIVE

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (53) |
|  |  |
|  | 100.0 |
| Say portions more expensive | 50.9 |
| Frice includes processing and packaging - prepreparation would tend to raise cost | 45.5 |
| Cost is more for amount of serving | 1.8 |
| Don't know - no answer | 3.6 |
| Portions less expensive | 21.8* |
| Less or no waste | 12.7 |
| Labor saving - requires no preparation | 5.5 |
| No spoilage - can keep in freezer, can keep until ready to use | 5.5 |
| All others | 1.8 |
| Don't know - no answer | 3.6 |
| About the same | 14.6 |
| Don't know | 9.1 |
| No answer | 3.6 |

*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?
Total Users of Portions $\quad \frac{\text { Total }}{(53)}$
q
100.0

Specify kind of fish
60.0

Do not specify kind of fish
40.0

Table 31

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

Total Users of Frozen
Processed Sea Food

$$
(104)
$$

Yes, would like other items . 9
No, would not like other items 81.9

Don't know 4.3

No answer 12.9

|  | WAS PRICE A REASON ESTABLISHMENTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | DID NOT BUY PORTIONS? |  |
| Total Establishments Using Frozen Processed Sea Food, but Not Portions | (51) |  |  |
|  | 中 |  | Total |
|  | $\underline{100.0 *}$ |  |  |
| Use fresh fish - prefer fresh fish | 21.3 | Total Nonusers Who Did Not Volunteer |  |
| Serve other types - perch, shrimp, haiibut, etc., other types more popular | 23.1 | Price as a Reasor | (46) |
| Sell, serve little or no fish - no demand, calls tion it | 13.5 |  | 中 |
| Prefer to prepare own - rather bread my own, do not like way it must be cooked, prefer own methods | 11.5 |  | 100.0 |
| Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh fish, cheaper to prepare ourselves | 8.2 | Yes, price was a reason | 1.8 |
| Size of portions - prefer to cut own portions, want larger portions, get more with other kinds | 6.6 | No, price was not a reason | 50.0 |
| Company makes the rules - policy against it | 6.6 |  |  |
| Don't like them so wouldn't serve them | $3 \cdot 3$ | No answer | 48.2 |
| No particular reason - just didn't | $3 \cdot 3$ |  |  |
| Just opened the restaurant - don't know what we will handle | $3 \cdot 3$ |  |  |
| Don't know, no answer | 16.4 |  |  |

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

Table 33

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

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (104) | (31) | (41) | (32) |
|  | \& | ¢ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Sea food processors | . 9 | 2.8 | - | - |
| Sea food wholesalers | 51.7 | 44.4 | 44.2 | 67.6 |
| Frozen food distributors | 44.8 | 50.0 | 51.2 | 32.4 |
| All other, grocery stores, supermarkets | 4.3 | - | 2.3 | 10.8 |
| No answer | 2.6 | 2.8 | 4.7 | - |

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


## Table 34

DISTANCE OF ESTABLISHMENT FROM MAIN SUPPLIER OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

## According to Location

|  | Total | Out of Central Business District | In <br> Central <br> Business <br> District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | （104） | （67） | （37） |
|  | 中 | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 10 miles | 72.4 | 76.7 | 65.2 |
| 10－50 miles | 6.9 | 9.6 | 2.3 |
| 51 － 100 miles | 17.2 | 10.9 | 27.9 |
| More than 100 miles | ． 9 | 1.4 | － |
| Don＇t know | 1.7 | 1.4 | 2.3 |
| No answer | ． 9 | － | 2.3 |

## Table 35

## FREQUENCY OF DELIVERIES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 20,000$ and Over |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (104) | (65) | (39) | (31) | (41) | (32) |
|  | 中 | \% | \% | \% | ¢ | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Every day | 5.2 | 6.5 | 2.6 | 11.1 | - | 5.4 |
| 2-4 times per week | 8.6 | 11.7 | 2.6 | - | 4.7 | 21.6 |
| Once a week | 71.6 | 66.2 | 82.0 | 69.4 | 86.0 | 56.8 |
| 2-3times per month | 6.9 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 13.9 | 2.3 | 5.4 |
| Once a month | 6.0 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 2.8 | 7.0 | 8.1 |
| Less than once a month | 1.7 | 2.6 | - | 2.8 | - | 2.7 |

Table 36

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

| According to Sales Volume |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (104) | (31) | (41) | (32) |
|  | 中 | \$ | 中 | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can improve services | 25.9 | 36.1 | 30.2 | 10.8 |
| No, cennot improve services | 71.5 | 55.6 | 69.8 | 89.2 |
| Don't know | 1.7 | 5.5 | - | - |
| No answer | . 9 | 2.8 | - | - |

## Table 37

## AMOUNT SPENT FOR FROZEN PROCESSED SEA

FOOD DURING PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS

## Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food

Spent under $\$ 250 \quad 48.6$
\$250-499
\$500-999
\$1,000-2,499
$\$ 2,500-4,999$
\$5,000-9,999
\$10,000-14,999
\$15,000-29,999
\$30,000 - 49,999
\$50,000 - 99,999
$\$ 100,000$ and over

Total
11.4
17.2
11.4
5.7
5.7
-
-

Table 38

## According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (104) | (31) | (41) | (32) |
|  | 中 | ¢ | \& | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Say sea food more profitable than other high protein foods | 16.4 | 16.7 | 7.0 | 27.1 |
| Say beef more profitable than sea food | 13.8 | 13.9 | 9.3 | 18.9 |
| Say meat (unspecified) more profitable than sea food | 2.6 | - | 4.7 | 2.7 |
| Say all foods the same in profitability | 2.6 | - | 2.3 | 5.4 |
| Say eggs more profitable than sea food | 1.7 | - | - | 5.4 |
| Say chicken more profitable than sea food | . 9 | 2.8 | - | - |
| Say miscellaneous other foods more profitable than sea food | 11.2 | 8.3 | 14.0 | 10.8 |
| Nonprofit establishments | 29.2 | 33.3 | 46.4 | 5.4 |
| Don't know | 14.7 | 25.0 | 9.3 | 10.8 |
| No answer | 6.9 | - | 7.0 | 13.5 |

## Table 39

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

According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (104) | (65) | (39) |
|  | \& | \& | \$ |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, know they can | 75.0 | 93.5 | 38.5 |
| No, do not know they can | 25.0 | 6.5 | 61.5 |

## Table 40

## DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR

## GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishment

** Included 15 establishments which are not shown separately as it would be statistically misleading.

## GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

According to Type of Establishment

| Total*** | Public <br> Eating <br> Places |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchasers of Government <br> Inspected or Graded Sea Food | (75) | (60) |
|  | \& | $\underline{\text { q }}$ |
|  | $\underline{100.0^{*}}$ | $\underline{100.0}$ |


| Best quality - use better products, more <br> uniform quality | 51.7 | 55.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Government inspected foods are safe - pure, <br> fresh, clean, no germs or disease | 44.8 | 41.7 |
| Only type available - it's all inspected, <br> that's what supplier carries | 10.3 | 9.7 |
| Prefer Government inspected - wouldn't <br> buy any other | 9.2 | 9.7 |
| All others | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| Don't know, no answer | 2.3 | 2.8 |

** Includes 15 establishments which are not shown separately as it would be statistically misleading.
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## Table 42

HAS GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AFFECTED THE AMOUNT OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD BOUGHT BY THE ESTABLISHMENT?

According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public Eating Places |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Government Inspected Frozen Processed Sea Food | (75) | (60) |
| t the same | 中 | \% |
|  | $\underline{100.0 * *}$ | 100.0 |
|  | 4.6 | 1.4 |
|  | 80.5 | 84.7 |
|  | - | - |
| now | 5.7 | 2.8 |
| r | 9.2 | 11.1 |

** Includes 15 establishments which are not shown separately as it would be statistically misleading.

Total Establishments Not Knowing Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available

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

Don't know

No answer
6.9

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (92) |
|  | \# |
|  | 100.0 |
| Have served frozen processed sea food before | 10.5* |
| Prefer to serve fresh fish | 5.7 |
| Lacked flavor - Own prepared fish has better flavor | 1.9 |
| No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods | 1.0 |
| Unable to handle preparation - didn't have the help | 1.0 |
| All others | 1.0 |
| Have not served frozen processed sea food before | 88.5* |
| Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, fresh fish available all year | 34.3 |
| Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not in that business | 31.4 4.8 |
| Just opened, don't know what I'll sell |  |
| Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh, prepare ourselves | 3.8 |
| No storage facilities - no freezer | 2.9 |
| Unable to handle preparation - no equipment, not enough room, no time, would need extra help | 1.0 |
| Like taste, freshness of fresh fish - don't trust frozen food, fresh fish tastes better, some frozen is kept too long | 1.0 |
| Don't know, no answer | 13.3 |
| Don't know | 1.0 |

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

Table 45

## DO ESTABLISHMENIS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \$40,000 <br> and Over |
| Total Establishments | (196) | (143) | (53) | (72) | (73) | (51) |
|  | \% | ¢ | \% | \% | 中 | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 69.2 | 76.2 | 47.2 | 57.8 | 70.0 | 84.5 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 29.4 | 22.0 | 52.8 | 39.8 | 30.0 | 13.8 |
| No answer | 1.4 | 1.8 | - | 2.4 | - | 1.7 |
| Average capacity, in cubic feet | 32.7 | 29.0 | (a) | 36.7 | 21.1 | 45.9 |

(a) Too few cases to compute an average.

## Table 46

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

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nonusers } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sea Food } \end{aligned}$ | Users Not <br> Using <br> Frozen <br> Processed <br> Sea Food |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | （92） |  |  |
|  | 中 | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 10.5 | 89.5 |
| Yes，have cold storage facilities | 68.5 | 5.7 | 62.8 |
| No，do not have cold storage facilities | 28.6 | 2.9 | 25.7 |
| No answer | 2.9 | 1.9 | 1.0 |

## 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 Establishments

|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (196) | (143) | (53) |
|  | \& | q |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total Receipts |  |  |  |
| Less than \$ $\$ 10,000$ | 37.6 | 38.1 | 35.8 |
| \$10,000 - 39,999 | 36.2 | 32.7 | 47.2 |
| \$40,000-99,999 | 14.9 | 15.5 | 13.2 |
| \$100,000 and over | 11.3 | 13.7 | 3.8 |

Table b

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Less |  | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39.999 \end{aligned}$ | and Over |
| Total Establishments | (196) | (143) | (53) | (72) | (73) | (51) |
|  | 中 | \% | \% | \& | \& | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$ $\mathbf{1}, 000$ | 3.6 | 5.8 | - | 8.3 | 1.9 | - |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 6.4 | 10.2 | - | 16.7 | 1.9 | - |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 18.1 | 14.5 | 24.4 | 36.1 | 11.3 | 4.8 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 16.4 | 21.6 | 24.4 | 33.3 | 11.3 | - |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 20.0 | 18.8 | 22.0 | 5.6 | 37.7 | - |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 20.0 | 20.3 | 19.5 | - | 34.0 | 19.0 |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 4.9 | - | - | 28.6 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | 6.4 | 8.7 | 2.4 | - | - | 33.3 |
| \$100,000-249,999 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.4 | - | 1.9 | 9.5 |
| \$250,000 and over | . 9 | 1.4 | - | - | - | 4.8 |

Table c

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OPERATING COST SPENI FOR FOOD IN PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment Public |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | （296） | （143） | （53） | （72） | （73） | （51） |
|  | 中 | 中 | 中 | q | 中 | \＄ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| Spent under 5\％for food | ． 9 | 1.5 | － | 2.9 | －${ }^{-8}$ | － |
| 5－14\％ | 6.6 | 3.0 | 12.8 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 10.0 |
| 15－24\％ | 2.8 17.0 | 3.0 23.9 | 2.6 5.1 | 2.9 23.6 | 3.8 13.5 | 15.0 |
| 25－34\％ | 17.0 | 23.9 | 5.1 | 23.6 | 13.5 | 15.0 |
| 35－44\％ | 22.7 | 28.3 | 12.8 | 14.7 | 23.1 | 35.0 |
| 45－54\％ | 20.8 | 31.3 | 2.6 | 11.8 | 21.1 | 35.0 |
| 55－64\％ | 27.4 | 6.0 | 64.1 | 35.3 | 30.8 | 5.0 |
| 65－74\％ | ． 9 | 1.5 | － | － | 1.9 | － |
| 75－84\％ | ． 9 | 1.5 | － | 2.9 | － | － |
| 85－94\％ | － | － | － | － |  | － |
| 95－100\％ | － | － | － | － | － | － |

## Table d

## AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

## According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

Potal Establishments $\quad \underline{\underline{196}} \quad$\begin{tabular}{l}
Type of Establishment <br>
Pablic <br>
Eating

$\quad$

Places
\end{tabular}$\underline{\underline{\text { Institutions }}}$

| Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 72 | 73 | 51 |
| 55 | 160 | 245 |
| 8 | 37 | 52 |
| 22 | 47 | 198 |
| 1 | 2 | 17 |
| 17 | 49 | 143 |
| 2 | 5 | 29 |
| 13 | 34 | 141 |
| 1 | 2 | 48 |

** Less than one half meal.

Table e

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

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fublic <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | （196） | （143） | （53） | （72） | （73） | （51） |
|  | 中 | 中 | $\underline{\text { q }}$ | 中 | \％ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Under \＄ 25 | － | － | － | 9 |  |  |
| \＄． $25-.49$ | 24.5 | 3.6 | 49.1 | 16.9 | 18.8 | 5.2 |
| \＄．50－． 74 | 27.6 | 33.9 | 7.5 | 36.2 | 23.6 | 20.8 |
| \＄． 75 －． 99 | 24.9 | 32.7 | － | 25.3 | 31.3 | 15.5 |
| \＄1．00－1．49 | 12.2 | 15.5 | 1.9 | 12.0 | 10.0 2.5 | 15.5 1.7 |
| \＄1．50－1．99 | 1.4 | 1.8 | － |  | 2.5 | 1.7 |
| \＄2．00－2．49 $\$ 2.50-2.99$ | .9 1.8 | 1.2 2.4 | － | － | － | 3.4 6.9 |
| \＄3．00－3．99 | 1.4 | 1.8 | － | － | － | 5.2 |
| \＄4．00－4．99 |  | － |  |  |  |  |
| \＄5．00 and over | － | － | － |  | － | － |
| No answer | 6.3 | 7.1 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 17.2 |
| Nonprofit establishment | 9.0 | － | 37.7 | 6.0 | 12.5 | 8.6 |

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total establishments | 196 | 72 | 73 | 51 |
| Average number per establishment | 6 | 2 | 4 | 14 |

## Table g

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

|  | Total | Type of EstablishmentPublicEatingPlaces Institutions |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| Total establishments | 196 | 143 | 53 | 72 | 73 | 51 |
| Average seating capacity, in seats | 95 | 82 | 138 | 64 | 87 | 152 |

Table h

NUMBER OF DAYS OF THE WEEK ON WHICH ESTABLISHMENTS SERVE MEALS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| Total Establishments | (196) | (143) | (53) | (72) | (73) | (51) |
|  | \% | d | 中 | \% | \& | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Serve on 7 days | 43.4 | 45.8 | 35.9 | 41.0 | 35.0 | 58.7 |
| Serve on 6 days | 35.3 | 44.1 | 7.5 | 39.7 | 33.7 | 31.0 |
| Serve on 5 days | 19.9 | 8.3 | 56.6 | 16.9 | 32.3 | 8.6 |
| Serve on less than 5 days | . 5 | . 6 | - | 1.2 | - | - |
| No answer | . 9 | 1.2 | - | 1.2 | - | 1.7 |

Table i

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

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000= \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$40,000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (196) | (72) | (73) | (51) |
|  | 中 | q | q | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments with no specialty | 82.4 | 75.9 | 88.7 | 82.8 |
| Establishments with specialty | 17.6* | 24.1 | 11.3 | 17.2 |
| Italian food | 6.3 | 10.9 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| Sea food | 3.6 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 6.9 |
| Chinese food | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 3.4 |
| Steak or chophouse | 1.4 | 2.4 | - | 1.7 |
| Chicken specialty | . 9 | 2.4 | - | 1.7 |
| Kosher | . 9 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| Mexican, Spanish | . 5 | - | 1.3 |  |
| All others | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.7 |

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

