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## Introduction


#### Abstract

At the request of a group of Ohio apple growers, the Department of Agricultural Economics of the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station initiated a study of the prepackaging of apples at producers' farms.

The principal inquiry was divided into two parts: (1) the costs and methods of prepackaging and (2) the consumer and store manager's experience and preferences in regard to prepackaged apples.

This report is primarily an interim report of the first year of study in the field of methods, costs, marketing, and consumer acceptance of farm prepackaged Ohio apples.


Prepackaging or consumer packaging can be defined as entailing the preweighing, prepackaging and, often, prepricing a product in units ready for purchase by the ultimate consumer.

Twelve growers with complete records were included in the farm study. A few other producers prepackaged some apples, but not on a very large scale. Twenty-four retail stores and 371 apple purchasers were contacted to ascertain marketing practices and consumer acceptance.

## Prepackaging Ohio Apples on the Farm

There is wide variation in all parts of the prepackaging operation on the farm. No standardized methods were found. It was a hand operation in all instances.

Packages
Eleven producers were using pliofilm bags. Five of these growers used the four pound, four used the five pound, and two used the three pound pliofilm bags. Four quart baskets were the second most popular with four users. Polyethylene bags and mesh bags were used by one grower each at the time the reports were taken. Later in the season several others used the Polyethylene and expressed preference for them due to their strength and ease of handing. Pliofilm bags stuck together and were difficult for the packers to separate.

Eight producers used only one type of package, three used two types of packages, and one grower used three types.

Various methods of closing the bags were used. The three most common were the use of wire, metal clamps, and rubber bands.

The price range per thousand packages extended from $\$ 16.00$ to $\$ 73.20$. Polyethylene five pound size bags had the lowest average at \$27.30 per thousand; pliofilm four pound at $\% 28.31$ I/ three pound at $\$ 28.501 /$ and five pound at $\$ 35.60$ per thousand. Five pound mesh bags averaged $i_{4} 42.50$. Baskets were the highest with four quart size at \$ $\$ 57.76$ per thousand average. These averages are of prices paid by the users.

Table 1. Type, Size, Average Costs, and Frice Range of Packages Used by Twelve Ohio Apple Prepackagers, 1950

| Type of Package | Number Using | Average Price per Thousand | Price Range per Thousand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pliofilm |  |  |  |
| Five pound | 4 | ¢ 35,60 | \$33.50 to \$38.90 |
| Four pound. | 5 | 28.31 | 16.00 to 34.00 |
| Three pound | 2 | 20.50 | 27.00 to 30.00 |
| Polyethylene |  |  |  |
| Five Pound | 1 | 27.30 | 27.30 |
| Baskets |  |  |  |
| Four Quart | 4 | 57.76 | 48.50 to 73.20 |
| Mesh Bag |  |  |  |
| Five Pound | 1 | 42.50 | 42.50 |

The average loss from breakage during the prepackaging operation was six bags per thousand or less than one percent. Almost one-half of the prepackagers reported no loss at all.

Prepacka\{ed apples were taken to stores or warehouses in master containers wiich usually were cardboard boxes. Other types of mester containers were egg crates, wooden bushel boxes, and used lettuce crates. The cost of master containers to the producers ranged from zero to 44 cents eaoh. Many growers were obtaining these containers second hand from various wholesalers, rotailers, and grocery chain companies.
1/This seeming paradox was probably the result of large purchase orders of the four pound than of the three pound bags.

Approximately two-thirds of the growers had their master containers returned from the store to them. The majority were returned free, others at a nominal charge. The average trip life of the master containor was 6.5 .

About half of the farm prepackagers delivered direct to the retail stores and the other half delivered to the warehouse.

All varieties and sizes of apples lend themselves to prepackaging. Ten different varieties were prepackaged by the 12 Ohio apple farm prepackagers furnishing records. Jonathan and INcIntosh were each packaged by four different growers. The $21 / 4$ inch apple was the leading size prepackaged.

From the standpoint of prepackaging operations none of the producers have volume enough to constitute a large scale operation. Average packers employed numbered less than three. Mechanization probably would not increase efficiency materially because of this small volume and also from the fact that labor costs averaged only 1.8 cents per package. Any savings made by mechanization would have to come by lowering the 1.8 cents per package cost. The small producer should be able to prepackage at about the same cost as large producers as long as the prepackaging is hand work.

Number of packages packed per worker varied from 23 to 80 per hour with an averace of 55.7 packages. The average hourly rate paid packers was $\$ .7425$ and the average hourly rate paid helpers was $\$ .805$. On the average one helper was necessary for each three packers. Some helpers placed the prepackaged apples in the master container, but usually this was the duty of the packer. The duty of the helper was that of keeping apples to the packers and taking the filled master containers away.

## Returns from Prepackaged Apples

The appearanoe of uniformly sized apples in an all visible package apparontly stimulated sales greatly. This was especially noticeable for the $21 / 4$ inch apple which was discounted in price only very slightly from similar quality of the larger sizes.

Most farm prepackagers agreed that prepackaging tends to move more apples in the same or shorter time, incroases gross cash income, significantly raises the price received for $21 / 4$ inch apples, and increases the net income. The percentage of increase varies greatly among growers.

A natural question would be how much did growers receive by prepackaging their apples over what they would have received if the apples were marketed in the bulk. In some cases the percent of increase in total returns was nogligible, such as the 3.4 percent increase reported on similar $23 / 4$ inch apples solling for 3.25 per bushel. On the other
hand, increases such as the 144 percent on similar apples selling for $\$ 1.00$ per bushel appcar to be tremendous. Any advantage from packaging where incrcasod returns would no more than cover added cost would have to be in moving more apples.

No comparison was available on four growers as two of them prepackaqed all apples and no information was obtained from the other two.

The average increase in return for the prepackaged over bulk apples was $\{.986$ por bushol. This increase of propackaged apples over similar apples sold in the bulk was 58.3 percent.

Table 2. Roported Gross Cash Incroaso Por Bushel in Selling Apples Prepackaged Ovor Similar Apples Sold in Bulk by Eight Ohio Applo Prcpackagers, 1950

|  | Increase <br> Por Bushel | Porcent <br> Increase | Number of Growers | Size of Apples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\} .11$ | 3.4 | 1 | $23 / 4$ inch |
|  | . 44 | 17.0 | 1 | $21 / 4,21 / 2,23 / 4$ inch |
|  | . 81 | 43.2 | 1 | $21 / 4$ inch |
|  | . 86 | 34.4 | 1 | $21 / 2$ inch |
|  | 1.25 | 65.8 | 1 | $21 / 4$ inch |
|  | 1.44 | 144.0 | 1 | $21 / 4,21 / 2$ inch |
|  | 1.49 | 79.2 | 2 | $21 / 4$ inch |
| Avorage | . 986 | 58.3 |  |  |

Cost of Propackaging
The ayoraeo cost of packaging a bushel of apples was 59.1 cents. These costs por bushel, including package, master container and labor expenses variod from a low of 45 cents to a high of 73.9 cents. Widest variation was in costs of master containor and labor.

Of the avorago cost of 59.1 cents for packaging a bushel of apples, 32.9 cents was for individual packages, 8.7 oonts for the master container, and 17.5 conts for labor.

If the producers who packaged their applos had marketed their apples in bulk they would have had container cost and labor expense for bulk packing. Thosc costs would have to bo substracted from the total cost of prepackaging to arrive at the net difference in the two methods. While oxact cost of bulk packing was not determined the estimate of several producers indicate that prepackaging costs about 20 cents more per bushel than bulk packing.

Markoting Practices Relating to Ohio Apples
Prepackagod at the Farm

Store managers and their produce managers were interviewed for their experience with prepackaged and bulk apples, their attitudes and their opinjons about the future and what should be done in the prepackaged apple field.

Tho attitude and cooperation of the rotail trade was excellent. Retailers expressed a desire to do anything within reason to aid the Ohio apple producers.

A total of 24 representative stores were visited during November, January and February in Akron, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Youngstown, Xenia and Yollow Springs in obtaining the data. Prorequisite for a store to bo included in this study was that they were handing Ohio prepackaged applos and bulk apples and that a sufficient volume was done to warrant tho interviewer's time. Volume of produce sold per store ranged from 3300 to 9,000 a week.

Stores in the survey had boen handing some prepackaged apples for an average of two yoars or more and usually purchased prepockaged apples from only ono grower. Displaying of prepackaged apples was fair to poor. Condition of the apples was good. Host growers had done a good job of grading and sizing bofore packaging.

The averate store handled only one size of package with the five pound pack predominating. Most stores handlod only one size and two different varictios in the propackaged apples. In bulk apples, the stores averaged 2.36 varieties made up of 1.39 local varietios, and .87 wostern varieties. Twenty of the 24 stores handled Western apples which made up 67.1 percont of all bulk sales.

The storos sold an average of 420.9 pounds of apples daily, made up of 238.5 pounds of bulk apples, and 182.4 pounds of farm prepaokaged apples. Bulk, however, only outsold farm prepackaged Ohio apples in 52.2 percont of the stores; 4.4 percent of the stores sold equal amounts of bulk and Ohio prepacked apples, while in the remaining 43.5 percent of the stores the Ohio prepackaged apples outsold the bulk apples. During the survoy when prepackaged apples were available all the time, the farm propackaged Ohio apple outsold all other apples by 753 pounds to 523 pounds or by 44 percent.

Eighteon of the 24 stores prepackaged some apples themselves in varying sizo bags. If store propackaged apple sales were combinod with the farm prepackafod apples, the prepackagod applos outsold bulk apples in 19 of the 24 stores. Where store prepackaging was done, 41.9 percont of tho applos roceived in bulk were packaged.

Tho avgrago sale of farm prepackaged apples was 4.33 pounds or 47.2 percont moro than tho averago bulk sale of 2.94 pounds. The avorago mark-up for the prepackagod applos was 31 percent and 52.6 for bulk applos.

Spoilage
Store roportod losses show prepackagod farm apples spoilage to be one-fifth thot of all other applo spoilago. Spoilare lossos for thoso reporting loss wore 2.2 percont for bulk applos and .44 percont spoilage for propaclagod applos.

Six rotailors roportod absolutoly no spoilage lossos in propackagod apples. The oxtendod shelf life, bottor turnover, good grading and loss customor handling all aid in lessening the spoilege in propackagod apples.

Rotailcr's Opinion of the Propackagod Unit
Of no littlo importance is the attitude of the retailor toward farm propackagod Ohio apples. Upon thoir buying and selling rest much of tho succoss or failure of farm propackagod applos.

Rotailcrs voro askod their opinion about farm prepackagod Ohio applos. Tho roteilcr was allowed to commont as ho carod to. Very few commentod on tho samo dotails and, in no caso wore they asked spocific quostions which might influonco their opinions.

Soventy-cieht porcent of the retailors stated that they liked the propackagod farm applcs. Only ono rotailor complainod of poor quality in tho packages. Mone stated any disliko for the farm prepackaged applos, but thoy did stato cortain things thoy thought would make for improvement in the propackaged apples. Incroasos of apple sales from 50 poroont to 300 porcent woro reportod with the offering of the prepackagod units.

Uniformity, good quality and loss spoilago in propackod apples were mentionod by many retailers as advantages, Clorks: time saved and convenience both for the retailor and customer wero also claimed. Retailers also mentioned sanitation and good accoptance by consumers (especially for familios with children) as advantages of prepackaged apples.

For improvements in the future, the most frequent comment was a desire for two sizes of bags. The throo pound and five pound packages were commonly requosted among the 56.5 percont of retailers desiring two package sizes.

Thirty porcont of the retailors wanted a more consistent supply. Five rotailers stated they would like all applos to be propackaged: Four retailors wantod more variety in the propackaged apples.

## Consumer Aoceptance of Farm Prepackaged Ohio Apples

Three hundred soventy-ono apple purchasers were interviewed for their opinions concorning their purchasc of apples. These purchesers, usually housowives, wero asked why they purchased the applos they did.

Reasons for purchasing prepackaged apples are given in Table 3. Most of tho purchascrs who said they purchasod the prepackaged apples regularly wont on to give some reasons why. The purchasers statement "buy regularly" is loft in tho tabulation as a significant figure. It shows that about one out of six become a regular customer despite the short period during which apples have been offered in this way,

Tablo 3. Reasons Given by 183 Customers in 23 Ohio Stores for Purchosing Propackaged Apples, 1950-51

| Roason | Number 1/ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Buy regularly | 59 |
| Convonionce | 52 |
| Bettor eatine quality | 47 |
| Better quality | 46 |
| Choapor | 31 |
| Bought for cooking and baking | 19 |
| Likos prepackage | 17 |
| Usos bag ovor | 15 |
| Sanitary | 14 |
| Size of packago | 13 |
| Likes for cooking and eating | 13 |
| Appearance | 11 |
| Likes small size apples | 11 |
| Buys for children | 10 |
| Trying first time | 9 |
| Profers Ohio apples | 9 |
| Well satisfiod | 7 |
| Apples keop better | 6 |
| Reliablo | 4 |
| Uniformity | 4 |
| Hoard they wore botter | 1 |
| Boucht first thing they saw | 1 |

I/ Total number of reasons exceed numbor of customers as many customers gave more than one reason.

Tho main roasons given for the purchaso of bulk applos rather than packaged were: 1) that they had never triod propacks, 2) the paokages offerod woro too large, 3) liko to pick out own apples, 4) size of the bulk apples suited botter, and 5) variety desirod was availablo only in bulk. Other answers given less frequently were that the apples in bulk were cheaper, don't trust any kind of packaged produce and that they merely purchased the first applos they saw.

A large number of purchasors of bulk apples had purchased western applos but as far as possible their answers were eliminated because they pertained to preferences for wostern apples over Ohio apples, rather than for propackaged over bulk applos.

The roasons given for purchasing bagged apples and for purchasing bulk applos provide good material from which morchandising of apples could be better fittod to consumer desirc.

