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CIRCULAR 66
INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC EATING PLACES are among the best of all potential markets for frozen fishery products. In recognition of this, a survey was undertaken to obtain information on the consumption of frozen processed fish and shellfish in these establishments.

This study was conducted in ten selected cities by Crossley, S-D Surveys, Inc., of New York City in order to obtain information which could be used by the fishing industry to increase consumer demand for fishery products. The data obtained for each city as a result of this survey, together with an explanation of the methods and procedures used, are published in a series as follows:

Circular 66 - Survey Methods and Procedures
Circular 67 - Atlanta, Georgia
Circular 68 - Chicago, Illinois
Circular 69 - Cleveland, Ohio
Circular 70 - Denver, Colorado
Circular 71 - Houston, Texas
Circular 72 - Los Angeles, California
Circular 73 - New York, New York
Circular 74 - Omaha, Nebraska
Circular 75 - Portland, Oregon
Circular 76 - Springfield, Massachusetts

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

These publications are available upon request from the Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.
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SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE
I. PURPOSE OF STUDY

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

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

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

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

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

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

c. Sources of supply of frozen processed sea food.

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

e. Method of cooking frozen processed sea food.

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

g. Reasons for not using frozen processed sea food.
II. METHODOLOGY

A. Definition of Terms

1. Frozen Processed Sea Food

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

2. Frozen Processed Fish

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

3. Frozen Processed Shellfish

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

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

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

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

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

C. Sample Design

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

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

With respect to the area sampling, it was necessary to divide each city into sampling units (areas made up of clusters of adjacent blocks) expected to contain almost equal numbers of establishments serving hot solid food and belonging to the first subuniverse (restaurants, hotels, bars, etc.). This was done
by plotting on up-to-date city maps a sample of such places, as listed on the most recent directories, and then outlining the boundaries of the areas so that they would enclose equal numbers of plotted establishments and so as to divide the space between two plotted establishments belonging to two different areas approximately equally between the two areas. From the total number of such areas (comprising the whole city), a probability sample of areas was selected and the selected areas were fully canvassed by the field staff.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of Clusters</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, New York</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td>30(1)</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 394 4,024 394 4,418

(1) All of city was included but it was divided into 30 assignments.
The universe of all public and institutional, nonmilitary, eating places serving hot solid food (for consumption on the premises) was subdivided, for each city, into four subuniverses, as follows:

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

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

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

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

In all ten cities except Chicago, Illinois and Cleveland, Ohio, the sampling fraction varied from one subuniverse to the other so that samples adequate for analysis purposes could be expected to be produced for all four subuniverses, even though the number of establishments in the four subuniverses varied greatly. (In Chicago, Illinois and Cleveland, Ohio, the number of establishments in the four subuniverses were such that, by taking the
same sampling fraction in all cases, adequate samples could be expected in all four subuniverses.) Because of the different sampling fractions within each city, the samples had to be reweighted so that all the findings could be shown for each city as a whole. As between cities, however, no reweighting was done, since each city involves a separate study with a separate sample. Therefore, even after reweighting, the "tabulating cases" for each city represent a different proportion of its universe, as shown in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Total Number of &quot;Tabulating Cases&quot; After Reweighting</th>
<th>Proportion of Universe Represented by &quot;Tabulating Cases&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1/ 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>1/ 7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1/ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1/ 2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1/ 2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1/ 4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, New York</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1/ 12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1/ 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1/ 2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1/ 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The proportions shown in the last column above represent the net effective proportions reflecting the different sampling rates, the reweighting factors applied to offset these different sampling rates, and the different completion rates achieved. The latter are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, New York</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

While the list sample was a single-stage sample, the area samples in all cities except Springfield, Massachusetts, were two-stage samples. The first stage was a sampling of areas, as explained above. The second stage was a sampling of the establishments listed by the field staff in their full canvas of the sampled areas. In Springfield, Massachusetts, the area sample, too, was a single-stage sample, because, in the first stage, the
areas selected comprised the whole city, this was necessary because the sample for subuniverse No. 3 (institutions) had to be a 100 percent sample, in order to provide adequate basis for analysis.

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

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

D. Data Processing

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

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

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

All data were punched onto IBM cards and verification checks were performed in accordance with standard tabulating procedures.
Each interview was then given its proper weight by duplication of its punch cards on the basis of the particular sampling rate used in selection of the establishment.

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

E. Reporting

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishments primarily engaged in serving food to the general public. (Restaurants, cafeterias, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishments serving food to limited groups of people. (Schools, plants, commercial enterprises, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class III

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

Class IV

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

Class I and IV

Public Eating Places

Class II and III

Institutions

Annual Sales Volume

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

Each city's report is presented in three parts:

Summary of Findings

Detailed Findings

Distribution of the Sample

In the Summary of Findings the highlights of the survey are discussed. It will be noted that for selected findings, reference has been made to how the results compare with the nine other cities included in the study.
The detailed findings are presented in the form of percentaged distributions to the responses to various questions asked. While the percentages are based on the weighted number of tabulation cases, the number appearing in parentheses at the head of each column is the actual number of interviews conducted.

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

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

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

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

III. RELIABILITY OF STUDY RESULTS

A. Sampling Error

Standard Error of the Proportions

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

\[ dp = \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n}} \]

and making appropriate adjustments for estimated loss of statistical efficiency of the sample due to clustering and for the gain due to stratification and the finite population factor.
The estimated adjustment factors for all ten cities in this survey are submitted in the following table together with the total number of completed interviews for each city as shown in the section on Sample Design.

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

Following are examples of how the table should be used.

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

\[
dp = \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{0.588 \times 0.412}{216}} = \sqrt{\frac{0.242256}{216}} \approx 0.0335
\]

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

\[
dp = 1.05 \times 0.0335 = 0.035175 \text{ (say 0.036)}
\]
This means that the chances are, 2 out of 3, that if all eating places in Denver had been interviewed with the same techniques used in this survey this proportion would have fallen between\.588 + .036 and .588 = .036, or between 62.4 percent and 55.2 percent.

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

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

\[
39.6\% \times 87 \text{ (size of subsample)} = 34.452
\]

\[
34.452 \div 216 \text{ (size of total sample)} = 16.0\%
\]

Applying the formula for simple random sampling:

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

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

\[
dp = 1.05 \times .02494 = .026187 \text{ (say .0262)}
\]
This is the standard error as a proportion of the total sample and must be converted back to represent a proportion of the subsample.

\[ 0.0262 \times 216 \text{ (size of total sample)} = 5.6592 \]

\[ 5.6592 \div 87 \text{ (size of subsample)} = 0.06505 \text{ (say } 0.065) \]

This means that chances are, two out of three, that if all eating places in Denver had been interviewed with the same techniques used in this survey, this proportion would have fallen between \(0.396 + 0.065\) and \(0.396 - 0.065\), or between 33.1 percent and 46.1 percent.

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

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

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

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

B. Nonresponse Error

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

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

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

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

1. Absence of the proprietor or a qualified representative, during the period of the field work.
2. Preoccupation of the proprietor with the Christmas rush, year-end inventories, or clerical work.

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

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

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

C. Response Errors

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

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

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

On the other hand, predominant errors may exist in quantitative responses in the smaller establishments since their records would tend to be less complete than those of larger establishments. However, the effect of quantities erroneously reported by small establishments would tend to be tempered by the greater weight of quantities given by large establishments.
The questionnaire and interviewer training are the main ways of controlling response error. On this study, it is considered that the questionnaire, field training, and supervision were such that response error was held to a minimum considering the nature of the data being collected.

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

1. Personal psychological motivations
2. Definition problems

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

Examples of such responses on this study are listed below:

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

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

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

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

Definition problems may cause a respondent to react as described above, or he may unconsciously give incomplete or
erroneous answers due to his misinterpretation of the terminology employed or lack of adequate concentration to the question which is asked. This becomes apparent in situations such as the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Obvious response errors were either corrected by the editorial staff or returned to the field for clarification.
Survey of Eating Places

December, 1958

Job # 1740

6a. How could the service be improved? 

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

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

1. Have you bought any seafood during the past 12 months? (INCLUDES FRESH, FROZEN OR CANNED FISH OR SHELLFISH)
   - Yes: 5-1
   - No: 2
   IF "NO," SKIP TO SECTION C

2. Have you bought any frozen processed seafood in the past 12 months? (THE ITEM YES BE PROCESSED AND DELIVERED IN THE FROZEN FORM)
   - Yes: -4
   - No: -5
   IF "NO," SKIP TO SECTION C

SECTION B - USERS

3. About how often do you get deliveries of frozen processed seafood?
   - Every day: 6-1
   - 2-4 times per week: 2-3
   - Once a week: 3-2
   - 2-3 times per month: 4-3
   - Once a month: 5-4
   - Less than once a month: 8-5

4. From what type of supplier do you usually get frozen processed seafood?
   - Seafood Processor: -8
   - Seafood Wholesaler: -9
   - Frozen Food Distributor: -0

   (Specify)

5. How far is your main supplier from this establishment?
   - Less than 10 miles: 7-1
   - 10-50 miles: 2-2
   - 51-100 miles: -3
   - More than 100 miles: -4
   - Don't know: -5

   (Specify)

6a. Can you think of any ways in which any of your frozen processed seafood supplier(s) could improve service to you?
   - Yes: 8
   - No: 9
   - O.K.: 0

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

b. Which supplier?
   - Seafood Processor: 8-1
   - Seafood Wholesaler: -2
   - Frozen Food Distributor: -3

   (Specify)

FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

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

   (Specify) 16-0

(Skip to Q. 19)

FOR EACH KIND ASK:

11. How were the _______ processed when you bought (Specify)

   them? Were they precooked, breaded or processed in any other way? (DESCRIBE THoroughLY)

12. Generally, are you satisfied with the amount of pre-preparation of the _______ or would you prefer more or less?

   (Specify)

   (SPECIES/FORM)

FOR EACH DIFFERENT SPECIES/FORM ASK:

13. What package size did you buy?

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

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

   (Specify)

   (SPECIFY)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)

   (Specify)
16a. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or not with the types and sizes of the frozen processed shellfish packages?

- Satisfied: 21-1
- Dissatisfied: -2
- D.K.: -3

IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 17
b. In what ways are you dissatisfied?

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

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

IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 18
b. Why are you dissatisfied?

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

- Fried: % 35-
- Broiled: 36-
- Baked: 27-
- Other: (Specify) % 38-

100%

PORTION CONTROLLED SEAFOODS

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

19a. Did you buy any portions like this during November?

- Yes: 20-1
- No: -2

IF "YES," SKIP TO Q. 20
b. Is there any particular reason why you didn’t? (PROBE)

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

20b. What are the principal disadvantages?

21a. Do you think your customers like portions better, about the same or less than other kinds of frozen processed fish?

- Portions better: 46-1
- About the same: -2
- Portions less: -3

IF "SAME" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 22
b. Why do you think that?

22a. Considering everything that goes into your total cost would you say that portions are more expensive, about the same or cheaper to use than other kinds of frozen processed fish?

- Portions more expensive: 48-1
- About the same: -2
- Portions cheaper: -3

IF "SAME" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 23
b. Why is that?

23a. Would you say that the quality of portions is better, about the same, or poorer than other kinds of frozen processed fish?

- Portions better: 50-1
- About the same: -2
- Portions poorer: -3

IF "SAME" OR "D.K.," SKIP TO Q. 24
b. Why is that?

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

FOR EACH TYPE ASK:

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

26. How many packages did you buy last month?

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

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

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

30a. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or not with the size of the portions in a package?

- Satisfied: 65-1
- Not satisfied: -2

IF "SATISFIED," SKIP TO Q. 31
b. What size portion, in ounces, would you prefer?
31. What percentage of the portions that you serve are... 
   fried? ___ % 69- 
   broiled? ___  69- 
   baked? ___  69- 
   Other... (specify) 70- 
   (specify) 100%

b. Do you cook portions while still frozen?
   Yes 72-1
   No -2

32. When you order portions from your supplier do you specify the kind of fish you want or not?
   Specify kind...  -4
   Do not specify kind  -5

33. Are you currently buying more, less or about the same amount of portions compared to a year ago at this time?
   Use more now...  -7
   About the same...  8
   Use less now...  -9
   D.K.  -10

34. Are there other portion controlled seafood items which are not now available but which you would like to have? (For example, canned sardines, portions packed with different kinds of sauces, etc.)
   Yes 73-1
   No -2
   D.K.  -3

IF "NO" OR "D.K." SKIP TO Q. 3A

35. What are they?

---

FROZEN PROCESSED FISH CARD 2

38. What were all the different kinds of frozen processed fish that you bought in the month of November? I don't mean the portion controlled or pre-shaped fish we have just discussed.
   None 5-X
   SKIP TO Q. 45

FOR EACH KIND ASK:

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

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

FOR EACH DIFFERENT SPECIES/FORM ASK:

39. What package size did you buy?

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

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

---

42a. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or not with the types and sizes of the frozen processed fish packages?
   Satisfied...  30-1
   Dissatisfied...  -2
   D.K.  -3

IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K." SKIP TO Q. 43

b. In what ways are you dissatisfied?

42a. Are you satisfied or not with the quality or condition of the frozen processed fish that you buy?
   Satisfied...  32-1
   Dissatisfied...  -2
   D.K.  -3

IF "SATISFIED" OR "D.K." SKIP TO Q. 44

b. Why are you dissatisfied?

44. What percentage of the frozen processed fish that you serve is...
   fried? 34-1
   broiled? 35-1
   baked? 37-1
   Other... (Specify) 37-

SKIP TO Q. 46 IN "NON PROFIT" ESTABLISHMENTS

45. Which is more profitable to you, frozen processed seafood or other high protein foods?
   Frozen Processed Seafood 30-1
   Other  (Specify)  D.K.  -1

ASK ALL

46. Over the past twelve months, how much did you spend for frozen processed seafood?
   $ 39-
   40-

SECTION C - NON-USERs

47a. Have you ever served any frozen processed seafood in this establishment?
   Yes 41-1
   No -2
   D.K.  -3

IF "NO" OR "D.K." SKIP TO QUESTION 48

b. Why did you stop serving frozen processed seafood?

42-
48. Is there any particular reason why you don't serve any frozen processed seafood?  

    Yes  45-
    No  47-

49a. Do you have any cold storage facilities which are used for keeping frozen processed seafood?  

    Yes  45-
    No  47-

50a. Is there any particular type of food that you specialize in serving?  

    Specialty...  48-
    No Specialty...  49-

50b. What is your specialty?  

    Steak or Chop House    -4 Chinese Food    -7
    Seafood..............  -5 Italian Food    -8
    French Food...........  -6 Health Food    -9
    Kosher  0

51. On how many days of the week are meals served here?  

    7 days.......  49-
    6 days.......  50-
    5 days.......  51-
    Less than 5  52-

52. What is your seating capacity?  

    # Seats  50-
    # 51-

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

    #  52-

53b. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?  

    #  53-

53c. About how many main mid-day (lunch) meals do you serve on Saturdays and Sundays?  

    #  54-

53d. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?  

    #  55-

54a. About how many evening (supper) meals do you serve each weekday, excluding Saturday and Sunday?  

    #  56-

54b. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?  

    #  57-

54c. About how many evening (supper) meals do you serve on Saturdays and Sundays?  

    #  58-

54d. How many of these are primarily seafood meals?  

    #  59-

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

    #  60-

56. In the last 12 months about how much did you spend for food?  

    $  61-

57. About what percentage was this of your total operating cost?  

    %  62-

58. In which of these groups would you report your total receipts from meals served during 1957 or your last fiscal year?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>73-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $40,000</td>
<td>74-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $60,000</td>
<td>75-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $60,000</td>
<td>76-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

    $  77-

60. TYPE OF FOOD SERVICE OPERATION  

Class I  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>76-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Place</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class II  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Plant Feeding</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class III  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for Handicapped</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostel</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Correction</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class IV  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Counter, Stand</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Person(s) interviewed</td>
<td>77-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>78-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Establishment</td>
<td>79-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>80-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>81-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>82-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>83-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.F. #</td>
<td>84-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>85-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>86-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Interview Started</td>
<td>87-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>88-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>89-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Interview Ended</td>
<td>90-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>91-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>92-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated By</td>
<td>93-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>