

Retail Grocery Store Services

types of telephone ordering and of delivery services offered
customers shown to be influenced by characteristics of store

Marilyn Dunsing and Jessie V. Coles

Continuation of the second article in a series of reports of a survey of characteristics of retail grocery stores in five counties in California made cooperatively by Departments of Home Economics, University of California, Berkeley and Davis, 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.

Fewer than one half of the 1,028 retail grocery stores surveyed in Alameda, Butte, Fresno, Los Angeles, and San Diego counties offered telephone ordering service to their customers. Alameda County had the highest proportion of stores offering such service and Butte County the lowest. Slightly over one half of the stores in four counties and somewhat more than one third in the fifth county offered a limited telephone service.

Urban stores provided some type of telephone service relatively more frequently—31%–53%—than rural stores—0%–39%—in all of the counties except San Diego. In Butte and Fresno counties—with relatively higher representations of rural stores—35%–53% of the urban stores and 13%–24% of the rural stores offered telephone service. In each county, the trend for rural stores

County to 50% in Alameda County provided telephone service.

Of the stores offering telephone service, over three fifths of the downtown stores in four counties placed no restrictions on its use. The exception was in Alameda County, where only 22% of such stores offered full telephone service.

On the other hand, over one half of the isolated and of the neighborhood-secondary stores in four counties placed restrictions on the availability of telephone service. The exceptions were in Fresno County where 40% of the isolated stores and 37% of those in neighborhood-secondary shopping areas offered limited service.

Telephone service was provided primarily by stores which were independently owned and operated as single units. The proportions of independent stores which made some type of telephone service available to their customers ranged from 32% of the stores in Butte County to 58% in Alameda County.

In each county, telephone service was provided relatively more frequently by independent stores affiliated with cooperative groups than by such stores which were not affiliated. From 41% of the affiliated stores in Los Angeles County to 65% in Fresno County as compared with 20% of the nonaffiliated stores in Butte County to 56% in Alameda County offered such service.

Telephone service was infrequently made available to customers of chain stores. In each county, one fifth or fewer of the chains provided some type of telephone service. Three per cent of the chains in Alameda County, 4% in San Diego County, 7% in Butte and Los Angeles counties, and 20% in Fresno County offered telephone service.

The extent to which independent stores with telephone service offered full or limited service varied considerably from one county to another. Stores were classified as using limited service if they provided the service for some but not for all customers, or if they provided it only for those customers who purchased a certain amount of goods, or if they made an extra charge for the service. If none of those restrictions was placed on the use of this service by customers, stores were classified as providing full service. In Fresno County the majority of inde-

pendent stores placed no restrictions on the use of this service. In Los Angeles County one half of such stores provided full and one half provided limited service, whereas, in Alameda, Butte, and San Diego counties the majority of them provided only limited telephone service.

The affiliated and nonaffiliated independent stores with telephone service differed in the extent to which full or limited service was made available to their customers. Of these stores offering such service, 50%–66% of the nonaffiliated stores offered full telephone service. On the other hand, 41%–76% of the affiliated stores offered limited service.

As in the case of independent stores, the type of telephone service provided by chain stores varied considerably from county to county. Of the chains providing such service, all of the stores in San Diego County, one half in Fresno County, one third in Los Angeles County and none in Alameda and Butte counties provided full telephone service.

For the most part, stores employing 3–6 persons offered telephone service relatively more frequently than stores employing either larger or smaller numbers of persons. From 39% to 76% of the stores with 3–6 employees made such service available. By comparison, 21%–51% of the stores with one or two employees, 0%–78% of those with 7–14 employees, and 0%–13% of those with 15 or more employees provided telephone service.

Of the stores offering telephone service, the tendency was for those employing one or two persons to provide limited telephone service somewhat more frequently than full service. Conversely, stores employing larger numbers of persons tended to provide full telephone service somewhat more frequently than limited service.

Delivery Service

Delivery service was not offered as frequently as telephone service in any of the counties surveyed except Butte. As in the case of telephone service, Alameda County had the highest proportion of stores offering delivery service and Butte County the lowest.

Of the stores with delivery service, the majority in Alameda, Los Angeles, and

Customer Telephone Service Offered by Surveyed Grocery Stores

County	Surveyed stores with telephone service	Type of telephone service	
		Full	Limited
Butte	28.5%	45.2%	54.8%
Fresno	44.7	63.2	36.8
San Diego	34.0	45.3	54.7
Alameda	48.5	42.5	57.5
Los Angeles	31.0	49.3	50.7

to restrict the availability of telephone service was more frequent—46%–100%—than for urban stores—36%–58%.

In various shopping areas, the tendency was for smaller proportions of isolated stores than of downtown or neighborhood-secondary stores to provide telephone service. From 6% of the isolated stores in Butte County to 41% in Los Angeles County made some type of telephone service available. By comparison, from 14% of the downtown stores in San Diego County to 70% in Fresno County, and from 30% of the neighborhood-secondary stores in Los Angeles

San Diego counties offered only limited service. By comparison, fewer than one half of the stores in Butte and Fresno counties limited their delivery.

Urban stores offered delivery service relatively more frequently—26%–46%—than rural stores—0%–33%—in all of the counties. In Butte and Fresno counties, 26%–46% of the urban stores as compared with 10%–25% of the rural stores provided delivery. Of the stores

its use. The exception was in Alameda County where only 30% of the stores provided full delivery service.

On the other hand, over one half of the neighborhood-secondary stores in each county—51%–62%—offered only limited delivery service. In each of four counties, over seven tenths of the isolated stores—71%–100%—also offered only limited service. The exception was in Fresno County where 30% of the isolated stores offered the limited type of delivery service.

Delivery service was provided primarily by independent stores. The proportions of independent stores offering this service varied from 23% in Butte County to 53% in Alameda County.

As in the case of telephone service, a larger proportion of affiliated independent stores in each county than of nonaffiliated stores provided delivery. From 33% to 64% of the affiliated stores as compared with 17%–48% of the nonaffiliated stores offered such service. Alameda County had the highest proportions of both groups of independent stores offering delivery service and Butte County the lowest.

Only a small proportion of the chain stores in each county, one eighth or fewer, offered delivery service. In three counties, Alameda, Butte, and Los Angeles, the proportion of chain stores that provided delivery—3%–7%—was the same as the proportion that provided telephone service. In San Diego County delivery was provided by 12% of the stores but telephone service by only 4%. Although one fifth of the chain stores in Fresno County offered telephone service, none of them offered delivery service.

Considerable variation from county to county existed in the extent to which independent stores with delivery provided full or limited service. In Butte and

Fresno counties the majority of stores—55%–57%—had not restricted the availability of this service. On the other hand, in Alameda, Los Angeles, and San Diego counties the majority of stores—57%–58%—provided only limited delivery.

Of the independent stores offering delivery service, 43%–72% of the affiliated stores as compared with 33%–58% of the nonaffiliated provided limited service.

None of the chain stores offering delivery service in Alameda and San Diego counties placed any restrictions on its availability. By comparison, 83% of the chain stores in Los Angeles County and all chain stores in Butte County placed some restrictions on delivery.

As in the case of telephone service, stores employing 3–6 persons, for the most part, offered delivery service relatively more frequently than stores with either larger or smaller numbers of employees. From 32% to 82% of the stores with 3–6 employees made such service available as compared with 16%–42% of the stores with one or two persons and 6%–67% of those stores with 7–14 employees. Relatively few—0%–20%—of the stores employing 15 or more persons offered delivery service.

Of the stores supplying delivery service, the tendency was for relatively more of those employing one or two persons—41%–73%—and of those employing 15 or more persons—50%–100%—to offer only limited service. Conversely, the majority of those stores with 7–14 employees—50%–100%—offered full service. The proportions of stores employing 3–6 persons that provided limited and full delivery service were about equal.

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

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

DEERBRUSH

Continued from page 11

Further studies are being made on deerbrush and other species of this genus to learn more about the relationship between nodules and nitrogen-fixation. There are about 40 species in this genus and at least one occurs in practically every plant association in California.

Deerbrush is abundant on many forest areas in California, especially in the ponderosa pine zone where the soil nitrogen is generally low. Deerbrush is also one of the more important browse species, being well liked by deer, cattle, and sheep.

James Vlamis is Associate Soil Chemist, University of California, Berkeley.

A. M. Schultz is Specialist in Forestry, University of California, Berkeley.

H. H. Biswell is Professor of Forestry, University of California, Berkeley.

The above reported studies are a part of a project conducted cooperatively by the University of California and the California Department of Fish and Game under Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act Project 51-R.

APPLE APHID

Continued from page 3

taking 25 curled leaves at random from each plot and counting the live and dead aphids.

The systemic insecticides, Systox and Thimet, and the nonsystemic phosphate, Diazinon, all gave good control of the aphids, and new growth remained free of infestation for the rest of the season. Guthion, Nialate, and Thiodan all gave a measure of control, but it was not suf-

ficient to prevent continued infestation of the foliage. By three weeks after application, the new growth on these plots was again heavily infested, and it was not possible to tell that a treatment had been applied.

These data, however, do show that it is possible to obtain control of the rosy apple aphid with a foliage treatment. The controls directed against the overwintering eggs are preferred, however, because it is easier and less costly to apply control materials during the delayed dormant period.

Harold F. Madsen is Assistant Entomologist, University of California, Berkeley.

J. Blair Bailey is Research Assistant in Entomology and Parasitology, University of California, Berkeley.

The above progress report is based on Research Project No. 806.