Fruits, Vegetables at Retail

availability of fresh and frozen fruits, vegetables varies with store size, location, and ownership as shown by survey

Jessie V. Coles and Marilyn Dunsina

All the larger stores—with seven or

more equivalent full-time employees-

carried both fresh and frozen fruits and

vegetables. Of those with 3-6 employees,

89% to 100% offered fresh and 93% to

100% stocked frozen products. Of those

with one or two employees, 85% to 98%

displayed fresh and 76% to 92% carried

In each county a high proportion of

the stores offering fresh fruits and vege-

tables obtained them from only one

source. That same practice was followed

by 98% of the stores in Alameda and

92% in Los Angeles. The next largest proportion was 86% in Fresno. Butte

with 74% and San Diego with 69% had

ing the fresh products and 24% in Butte

bought from two sources. In Fresno, 13%—and in the other counties, smaller

proportions-obtained them from two sources. In San Diego 3%, in Butte 2%

and in the other counties less than 1%

Wholesale fruit and vegetable markets

-and wholesalers not in organized mar-

bought from three or more sources.

In San Diego, 28% of the stores carry-

frozen fruits and vegetables.

the lowest proportions.

Sources

The following article is the fourth of a series of reports of a survey of characteristics of and services offered by retail grocery stores in five counties in California made cooperatively by the Department of Home Economics, University of California, and the United States Department of Agriculture under the authority of the Research and Marketing Act as part of Western Regional Research Project WM-26.

From 94% to 99% of 1,028 representative retail grocery stores surveyed in Alameda, Butte, Fresno, Los Angeles, and San Diego counties offered fresh or frozen-or both-fruits and vegetables to their customers.

Fresh fruits and vegetables were available slightly more frequently except in San Diego where 94% of the stores carried fresh and 96% carried frozen prod-

Both kinds of products were stocked by 83% to 92% of the stores. Relatively small proportions of the stores in each county offered fresh products only or frozen products only. Neither fresh nor frozen was carried by 1% to 6% of the

In the two counties which had the highest proportions of rural stores-Butte and Fresno-the rural stores carried fresh fruits and vegetables more frequently than the frozen. Although all the rural stores in Butte had fresh fruits and vegetables only 87% stocked the frozen. In Fresno 91% of the rural stores carried fresh but only 73% offered the frozen.

In all five counties, from 90% to 99% of the urban stores stocked the fresh products and from 88% to 96% had the frozen. Los Angeles had the lowest proportions of stores offering both the fresh est for frozen.

In Alameda and Los Angeles the proportions of stores in neighborhoodsecondary shopping areas which carried fresh and the proportions of the stores carrying frozen fruits and vegetables were higher—88%-96%—than the proportions of downtown stores-79%-90%. In Butte, the proportions of stores offering fresh and of those offering frozen products were higher in stores in the downtown areas than in stores in neighborhood-secondary areas. In Fresno, this was true for frozen fruits and vegetables but the reverse was true for the fresh products.

Fresh fruits and vegetables were carried somewhat more frequently than the frozen by the isolated stores. From 93% to 100% offered the fresh and from 74% to 94% had the frozen.

All the chain stores—two or more units-carried frozen fruits and vegetables. With the exception of one chain in San Diego and one in Los Angeles all of them stocked fresh fruits and vege-

The independent stores surveyed did not carry fresh or frozen-or bothfruits and vegetables as frequently as did chain stores. Of the independents affiliated with buying groups from 95% to 100% carried fresh and the same proportions carried frozen products. From 80% to 98% of the nonaffiliated independents stocked fresh and 74% to 93% had frozen fruits and vegetables.

and the frozen. Butte had the highest proportion for fresh and San Diego the high-

> kets-were the major sources for the stores. The relative importance of those

two sources varied among counties. In Alameda, Los Angeles, and San Diego counties 48% to 50% of the stores carrying fruits and vegetables bought at least some of them from wholesale markets. In Fresno 74% and in Butte only

Wholesalers outside the markets were patronized by over 80% of the stores in Butte, by 40% in San Diego, 43% in Los Angeles, by 25% in Fresno and 28% in Alameda counties.

15% followed that practice.

Two other sources were reported as rather important in several of the counties. In Los Angeles 12% and in Alameda 13% of the stores carrying fresh fruits and vegetables bought some from selfowned warehouses. In Alameda 72% and in Los Angeles 50% of the chain stores followed that practice. On the other hand only 35% of the chains in San Diego, 13% in Butte and 10% in Fresno reported that they obtained fresh fruits and vegetables from self-owned warehouses.

Concluded on next page

Major Sources From Which Stores Carrying Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Obtained Them

	Location		Shopping area			Ownership			Number of employees			
Ī	Rural	Urban	Down- town	Neigh- bor- hood Sec.	Iso- lated store	Ind Unaffili- ated	epende Affili- ated		1 or 2	3 to 6	7 to 14	15 or more
			A. Who	olesale i	Fruit a	nd Vegel	able N	larkets				
Butte	35.5	6.5		12.3	26.5	28.3	2.5		23.3	3.6		11.5
Fresno	78.0	72.1	63.2	76.7	72.5	75.2	67.6	80.0	69.8	80.0	77.8	80.0
San Diego	44.4	50.0	50.0	52.2	33.3	52.2	48.4	39.1	51.3	46.3	50.0	44.4
Alameda	*	50.6	55.6	51.1	*	54.3	57.9	27.6	54.1	56.2	35.3	27.3
Los Angeles.	*	48.0	54.5	47.7	•	40.6	56.0	45.6	47.9	45.5	60.0	45.1
			В. 1	Fruit an	d Vege	table W	holesa	lers				
Butte	54.8	92.2	88.2	89.5	64.7	66.0	100.0	86.7	70.0	96.4	100.0	88.9
Fresno	19.5	27.9	36.8	23.2	25.0	20.8	35.3	40.0	26.7	24.4	22.2	20.0
San Diego	27.8	41.4	35.7	38.3	33.3	41.3	45.2	26.1	39.7	48.8	31.2	22.2
Alameda	*	27.8	11.1	29.3	*	42.4	15.8		38.8	18.8		9.1
Los Angeles.	•	42.7	30.3	43.8	•	60.8	47.6	6.5	54.8	55.4	20.0	7.0

^{*} Number of rural and of isolated stores were too small to be of significance.



-now ready for distribution-

Single copies of these publications—except the Manuals—or a catalog of Agricultural Publications may be obtained without charge from the local office of the Farm Advisor or by addressing a request to: Agricultural Publications, 22 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4.

THE U. C. SYSTEM FOR PRODUCING HEALTHY CONTAINER-GROWN PLANTS, edited by Kenneth F. Baker, Man. 23 (\$1.00).

CUCUMBER PRODUCTION IN CALIFORNIA, by Glen N. Davis and Bernarr J. Hall, Man. 24 (25¢).

RICE FERTILIZATION, by D. S. Mikkelsen, D. C. Finfrock, and M. D. Miller, Leaf. 96.

WEED CONTROL IN RICE, by D. C. Finfrock, K. L. Viste, W. A. Harvey, and M. D. Miller, Leaf. 97.

STAKES AND MISTAKES IN COTTON, by Trimble R. Hedges, Leaf. 98.

ESTABLISHING A RICE STAND, by D. C. Finfrock and M. D. Miller, Leaf. 99.

SOIL MOISTURE TENSIOMETER, by S. J. Richards and R. M. Hagan, Leaf. 100.



(rev.).

Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, \$300 University of California College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, Berkeley 4, California

Paul J. Sharp.

GRADING LAND FOR SURFACE IR-

RIGATION, by James C. Marr, Cir. 438

SUDANGRASS FOR HAY, PASTURE, SEED, by Luther G. Jones, John R. Gross, Milton D. Miller, and Maurice L. Peterson, Cir. 462.

FERTILIZERS AND COVERCROPS FOR CALIFORNIA ORCHARDS, by E. L. Proebsting, Cir. 466.

AGRICULTURAL PUBLICATIONS, new catalog of agricultural publications.

RETAIL

Continued from preceding page

One fourth of the stores carrying fresh fruits and vegetables in Butte County re-

ported that they bought, at least some, direct from farms or from farmers' markets. Over 18% of the stores in San Diego and 13% in Fresno reported that practice.

As shown in the table on the preceding page, the proportions of stores that patronized wholesale fruit and vegetable markets did not vary significantly—in most counties—from one subclass to another within the major classifications based on location, shopping area, ownership, and number of equivalent full-time employees. The same was true of the proportions of stores buying produce from fruit and vegetable wholesalers.

Jessie V. Coles is Professor of Family Economics, University of California, Berkeley.

Marilyn Dunsing is Assistant Professor of Home Economics, University of California, Davis.

DONATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Contributions to the University of California for research by the Division of Agricultural Sciences, accepted in February, 1958

BERKELEY	
State Board of Forestry	
For research in drying, mechanical tests, and gluing studies	
Stauffer Chemical Co	
DAVIS	
Abbott Laboratories	
California Sugar Beet Processors	
California Tomato Growers Assoc., Inc\$500.00 For research in food technology	
Golf Course Superintendents Assoc. of Northern California\$250.00 For the turfgrass program	
National Renderers Assoc\$2,000.00 For research on the evaluation of nutritional value of meat scrap and devising ways and means of improving its quality	
Sugar Research Foundation, Inc.	
To study the use of sugar in nonsweet foods\$1,000.00	
For project to determine the consumer acceptance and preference for wines sweetened with sucrose \$750.00	
For research on the role of the sweetener in food preservation	

For study on the effects of sweetness on the consumers acceptance of apricots, pears and peaches.....\$2,500.00

For research on the effect of modifying the genotype on anatomical, physiological and biochemical expression of muscular dystrophy.....\$37,369.00

LOS ANGELES

RIVERSIDE

General Chemical Division......\$500.00

For research on hexachloroacetone to determine its effectiveness and safety for control of bermudagrass in citrus orchards

For field testing of insecticides and fungicides

STATEWIDE

U. S. Public Health Service