

AVERAGE NUMBER OF LINEAR FEET FREEZER SPACE

	Higher in- come area	Low income area
Atlanta:		
Chain.....	58	32
Large independent.....	43	18
Small independent.....	16	16
Chicago:		
Chain.....	143	110
Large independent.....	46	27
Small independent.....	40	7
Houston:		
Chain.....	54	55
Large independent.....	57	47
Small independent.....	42	25
Los Angeles:		
Chain.....	188	75
Large independent.....	80	31
Small independent.....	19	9
New York City:		
Chain.....	82	55
Large independent.....	36	20
Small independent.....	25	17
Washington, D.C.:		
Chain.....	100	100
Large independent.....	31	10
Small independent.....	12	9

APPEARANCE OF OUTLETS

The BLS agents were asked to make their own evaluations of each store from which they collected price data relative to its cleanliness, orderliness of stock, and completeness of inventory for a store of its type and size. These evaluations were reported by four gradations: top, good, average, and inferior. Even though the agents may differ among themselves in their interpretation of these grades, this should not affect the comparability of ratings between stores located in the different income areas within the same city, since an agent was assigned an equal number of stores in each of the two income areas within the city. However, because of the possibility of differences in agents' evaluations, no comparison should be made between cities.

In all six cities a considerably smaller proportion of the stores in the lower income areas were rated top in each of the three characteristics than were the stores in the higher income areas. For the six cities combined, half as many stores in the low as in the higher income area achieved the top rating in cleanliness and orderliness. Only about 40 percent as many stores in the low-income area as in the higher received this rating for completeness of stock.

At the other end of the scale, a much larger percent of the stores in low-income areas received an inferior rating than did those in the higher income area. Taking the six cities as a group, from six to seven times as many stores in the low-income area received an inferior rating relative to cleanliness and completeness of stock as did those in the higher income areas. The contrast between the two areas for the proportion of stores rated inferior so far as orderliness was concerned was less marked—about twice as many received this rating in the low-income area as in the high. This was because a larger number of stores in the higher income area were rated inferior for orderliness than for either of the other two characteristics. About the same number of stores in the low-income area—but not always the same stores—received the inferior rating for each of the characteristics.

For the six cities combined, a total of 57 comparisons should have been possible (19 matched chainstores, three characteristics each) for chainstores in the two income areas. Because in several cases the agent did not evaluate these characteristics in one or both of the income areas, 47 comparisons can be made. For these 47 comparisons, the agents assigned the same grade to the two stores of the same chain within the same city in 28 cases, and different grades in 19. In no case did the evaluation of stores of the same chain organization within the city differ by more than one grade (that is, top versus good, good versus average, average versus inferior). The differences were about equally divided between the three characteristics. Relative to cleanliness, in six comparisons the store in the higher income area received a better grade than did the one in the low-income area, while in one comparison the opposite was true. For orderliness, four stores in