AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices

. U54

FARMER-TO-CONSUMER MARKETING

H. R. Linstrom

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
RECEIVED
JUN 19 1978
PROCUREMENT SECTION
Alphabetical Serial File

Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
ESCS-01

SUMMARY

Estimates of direct marketing by producers to consumers for 1976 indicate there are 8,915 roadside stands, 3,069 pick-your-own operations and 541 of the more permanent farmers' markets operating in 41 of the 50 States and in the District of Columbia. Estimates for those States not reporting bring the total estimated outlets to over 13,000. Roadside stands in 17 States alone grossed almost $209 million in 1976.

Most items sold through direct marketing outlets are fruits and vegetables. Other items include eggs, dairy products, meat, poultry, baked goods, tree nuts, honey, shrubbery, and handicrafts.

Farmers view direct marketing as an alternative outlet to increase their income. Consumers see it as a means of getting fresher, higher quality foods at less cost. Consumers also find the markets convenient and friendly places to shop.

Under the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976, eight States were awarded funds in fiscal year 1977 to encourage and promote direct-marketing activities. Projects funded range from a joint Georgia-South Carolina effort aimed at low-income consumers and limited-resource farmers, to New Jersey's educational film production for producer and consumer groups.

FARMER-TO-CONSUMER MARKETING

H. R. LINSTROM

INTRODUCTION

There appears to be revived interest in the original method of selling farm products--direct marketing by producers to consumers. Farmers, especially small and part-time farmers, view direct marketing as an alternative market outlet to increase their income. Consumers see it as a means of gaining access to fresher, higher quality foods at less cost. Consumers also envision social and cultural benefits from direct contacts with farmers, visits to farms, and a so-called return to nature.

Passage of Public Law 94-463, the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976, reflects national interest in direct marketing of farm products. There is strong evidence of increased attention by the States, and a number of educational and supportive programs are being sponsored by State cooperative extension services and departments of agriculture and commerce. At a more local level, municipal agencies, consumers, and public interest groups are supporting or sponsoring direct-marketing activities. An apparent growth in consumer food-buying clubs and cooperatives, while not directly related to direct marketing of farm products, shows a concern on the part of consumers in developing alternatives to the supermarket as a source of food.

This report brings together available information to describe the current status of direct marketing of agricultural products in the United States.

Methodology

To obtain information on the current status of farmer-to-consumer direct-marketing activities, the Economics,

Statistics and Cooperatives Service investigated fruit and vegetable marketings, compiled secondary data from all known published sources, and queried selected individuals knowledgeable in such activities, including extension marketing specialists and/or State department of agriculture personnel in all 50 States. These contacts provided expert estimates and opinions on the extent and direction of farmer-to-consumer direct marketing of fruits and vegetables across the country. Published materials available from the contacts are listed in the bibliography.

The most recent survey of the extent of direct-marketing activities was made by the American Vegetable Grower in the fall of 1976 (2). 1/ This involved a mail survey of agricultural economists and horticulturists at land-grant universities in all 50 States. Respondents were asked to provide estimates of the number of various types of direct-marketing outlets operating in their States, and the approximate volume of gross sales of fruits and vegetables from these outlets. Most of the information available on direct marketing nationwide is of this same nature. Little is based on a survey of a representative sample of producers, direct-marketing outlets, or consumers.

Information also was obtained from some individual State surveys of direct-marketing activities. New Hampshire, for example, has detailed figures on the actual crop-by-crop percentages of total sales directly marketed at roadside stands and through pick-your-own operations. Louisiana has interviewed consumers to find out the when and why of patronage habits at farmers' markets in that State (5). Minnesota has looked closely at direct-marketing activities within the State, and at other alternative food sources, such as backyard gardening and home canning and freezing (4).

DIRECT MARKETING

Direct marketing of agricultural products is not a new phenomenon. It is the original, purest type of food distribution. As soon as the first city became a reality, there existed a market for agricultural produce at a place away from the production location. Personal selling by the grower gave way to a distribution network that evolved through various stages of small shops to the modern 30,000-square-foot supermarket. In recent years, however, a

1/ Underscored numbers in parentheses indicate references listed at the end of this report.

reverse trend seems to have emerged. For reasons ranging from the economic "direct farm-to-consumer marketing is the only way to lower food food prices" to the nostalgic "it smells like the country... I feel like I'm in another time", consumers are returning to shop at direct-marketing outlets.

Direct marketing may take many forms. The most familiar types of outlets are probably roadside stands, pick-your-own operations, and farmers' markets. Some direct sales also are made from trucks parked at shopping centers, on door-to-door routes through urban and suburban neighborhoods, from small, on-farm dairy outlets, and through farmers' cooperatives dealing directly with consumer groups, such as buying clubs and consumer co-ops.

Informal arrangements between friends and neighbors move additional small quantities of agricultural produce from farmer to consumer, especially in some rural areas. Custom livestock slaughtering in some Western States is another example of direct marketing.

Items most frequently sold through direct-marketing outlets are fruits and vegetables, and to a lesser extent, eggs and dairy products. In some States, meat and poultry are sold directly to consumers, as are baked goods, tree nuts, honey, sirup, bedding plants, shrubbery, Christmas trees, and handicrafts. As fruits and vegetables make up the majority of sales, the figures in this report concern mainly these items.

Areas of heavy fruit and vegetable production generally have the greatest amount of activity in direct marketing, and the States involved tend to be those with high population concentrations. In other words, for populous areas in which the commercial agriculture of the region is in fruits and vegetables, or other products particularly suited to direct marketing, the potential for direct marketing seems to be more current and advanced.

The relationships among State population, fruit and vegetable production, and direct marketing are illustrated in table 1, with the Northeast, the Great Lakes, California, and Florida emerging as leaders. As one observer noted, a direct-marketing outlet must have "enough goods to make the trip worthwhile for customers, enough customers to make the trip worthwhile for farmers" (6).

Florida and California present a special case when it comes to evaluating the impact of direct marketing.

Although they do not have the population density of the Northeast and Great Lakes, for years they have had numerous roadside and edge-of-town retail markets where purchases are made directly from producers. A small but significant volume of fruit has moved in this manner, especially in Florida.

Relatively short growing seasons and low population concentrations help to explain the apparent low level of direct-marketing activities in States such as Alaska and Wyoming. Also, the agriculture of many Plains and Mountain States is concentrated in grain and cattle, which do not readily lend themselves to direct marketing. Much the same can be said for large agricultural regions of the South; cotton and tobacco for example, are seldom marketed directly to the end-user.

Exceptions can be found, of course, such as the apples grown in the southeastern corner of Nebraska and in western Colorado, or the fruit and vegetable production in south-central Kansas. In States where commercial agriculture is more oriented to grains, there are small and part-time farmers around population centers who are interested in alternative crops suitable for direct marketing.

Table 1--Relationships among State population, fruit production, vegetable production, and direct marketing

Ranking	Population 1/		Fruit production/ sq. mile 2/	Vegetable production/ sq. mile 2/	Direct-marketing outlets
	Per sq. mile	Total			
	States				
1	N.J.	Calif.	Fla.	N.J.	N.Y.
2	R.I.	N.Y.	Calif.	Calif.	N.J.
3	Mass.	Pa.	Wash.	Fla.	Ohio
4	Conn.	Tex.	N.J.	N.Y.	Mich.
5	Md.	Ill.	N.Y.	Del.	Pa.
6	N.Y.	Ohio	Mass.	Mass.	Calif.
7	Del.	Mich.	Mich.	Mich.	Conn.
8	Pa.	N.J.	Pa.	Conn.	N.C.
9	Ohio	Fla.	Conn.	S.C.	Ind.
10	Ill.	Mass.	Va.	Md.	Tex.

1/ Source: Census of the Population: 1970.
2/ Source: Agricultural Statistics, 1975.

Table 2 is a roughly estimated summary of direct marketing activities in the United States. It includes outlets in the three major categories--roadside stands, pick-your-own operations and farmers' markets. Data for this summary table are from the American Vegetable Grower survey of direct marketing outlets (2), and various State Government, extension, and university sources. Estimates for all three major types of direct-marketing outlets show at least 12,525 in operation in 1976. Estimates for nine States not reporting bring the total to about 13,000.

According to the American Vegetable Grower survey, gross sales from direct marketing outlets in Indiana increased from about $2.5 million in 1971 to $6 million in 1976. Maryland reported in the survey that during those years, the number of roadside markets and pick-your-own operations increased an estimated 25 percent and 100 percent, respectively. Research done at the State University-Rutgers, New Brunswick, N.J., indicates that roadside markets in Michigan doubled in number during 1965-1975, and that the volume of business increased at an even greater rate.

Roadside Stands

There were an estimated 8,915 roadside fruit and vegetable stands in the United States in 1976. A roadside stand is a commercial farm market operated by a full- or part-time grower. States with the greatest number of such markets include New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, California, Connecticut, Michigan, and Texas (table 2).

This talley does not include 12 States for which estimates are not available. Several of these States probably also have direct-marketing enterprises. States such as Kansas and Washington are known to be active in some aspects of direct marketing, and despite their relatively short growing seasons, would probably add another 100 to 200 roadside stands to the count. About the same number may exist in the remaining States, bringing the total number of roadside stands to roughly 9,300.

Top-ranking States in estimated gross sales from roadside stands included New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and Massachusetts (table 3).

Table 2--Direct-marketing outlets for farm products, 1976

State	Roadside stands	Pick-your-own operations	Farmers' markets	Total estimated outlets
Alabama	160	240	1/ 15	415
Alaska	12	NA	1	13
Arizona	35	5	NA	40
Arkansas	1/ 100	1/ 40	15	155
California	1/ 600	100	1/ 15	715
Colorado	15	NA	NA	15
Connecticut	1/ 600	1/ 50	6	656
Delaware	115	25	1/ 3	143
District of Columbia	0	0	3	3
Florida	200	100	30	330
Georgia	1/ 60	1/ 70	19	149
Hawaii	5	NA	10	15
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	1/ 200	200	1/ 20	420
Indiana	1/ 400	1/ 125	1/ 12	537
Iowa	1/ 85	1/ 25	1/ 6	116
Kansas	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kentucky	1/ 100	20	4	124
Louisiana	NA	NA	20	20
Maine	180	25	1/ 12	217
Maryland	1/ 250	100	1/ 4	354
Massachusetts	370	1/ 40	1/ 7	417
Michigan	1/ 550	1/ 300	1/ 28	878
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	1/ 70	20	1/ 7	97
Missouri	60	80	20	160
Montana	NA	NA	NA	NA

1/ See footnote at end of table.

Continued--

Table 2--Direct-marketing outlets for farm products, 1976--Continued

State	Roadside stands	Pick-your-own operations	Farmers' markets	Total estimated outlets
Nebraska	NA	NA	2	2
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Hampshire	350	50	1/ 5	405
New Jersey	810	130	1/ 14	954
New Mexico	100	1/ 40	NA	140
New York	1/ 800	1/ 330	60	1,190
N. Carolina	1/ 300	250	1/ 35	585
N. Dakota	1/ 3	1/ 12	1/ 2	17
Ohio	1/ 600	1/ 300	1/ 20	920
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	NA	NA	1/ 12	12
Pennsylvania	1/ 600	1/ 100	70	770
Rhode Island	1/ 30	1/ 12	1/ 2	44
S. Carolina	30	15	2	47
S. Dakota	100	1/ 10	NA	110
Tennessee	1/ 150	1/ 100	1/ 14	264
Texas	1/ 500	1/ 10	1/ 10	520
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	1/ 140	15	1/ 15	170
Virginia	20	40	14	74
Washington	NA	NA	NA	NA
W. Virginia	1/ 95	1/ 50	1/ 7	152
Wisconsin	120	40	NA	160
Wyoming	NA	NA	NA	NA
Totals	8,915	3,069	541	12,525

NA--Estimate not available.

1/ Estimates are from (2). All other numbers are primarily based on estimates provided by State sources.

Table 3--Estimated gross sales of roadside stands, 1976 1/

State	Gross sales
	1,000 dollars
New Jersey	50,000
Pennsylvania	40,000
New York	35,000
Ohio	30,000
Massachusetts	24,750
Indiana	6,000
Maryland	5,000
Michigan	4,500
New Hampshire	3,230
Arizona	2,875
Tennessee	2,500
Texas	2,500
Georgia	750
Rhode Island	750
North Carolina	580
South Dakota	375
North Dakota	20
Total	208,830

1/ Estimates not available for all States.
Source: (2).

Pick-your-own Operations

Pick-your-own operations for 1976 are estimated at 3,069, with no information available for 15 States. This number includes only planned operations as opposed to those run as clean-up operations toward the end of harvest-time. Some of the pick-your-own operations were operated in conjunction with already established roadside stands.

Leading States in the number of pick-your-own operations include New York, Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, Alabama, and Illinois (table 2). Over 60 percent of the operations sold primarily fruits, and about 35 percent sold primarily vegetables.

Farmers' Markets

Farmers' markets are one of the oldest methods of direct marketing. They are more formalized, and possibly more permanent, than the other direct-marketing operations. They are located in either publicly or privately owned market places where a grower rents space in which to display and sell produce. Most students of direct marketing say that farmers' markets are increasing in number across the country. Although an accurate count is not available, there were an estimated 541 farmers' markets in 36 States and the District of Columbia in 1976. For the entire United States, the number probably approached 600.

ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT MARKETING

At least two States, Louisiana and Missouri, have completed studies to evaluate consumer reactions to farmers' markets (5 and 3, respectively). The Agriculture Council of America also recently surveyed some 2,500 consumers on certain aspects of farmer-to-consumer direct marketing (1).

In the Louisiana study, published in March 1977, over 70 percent of the respondents considered themselves to be regular shoppers at farmers' markets. The main reasons noted for shopping there centered on the consumers getting fresher produce (50 percent) at better or more economical prices (19 percent), such markets were conveniently located for the shopper (7 percent), and the markets provided a friendly atmosphere in which to shop (5 percent). Nearly 90 percent of the Louisiana respondents indicated that they found both the price and quality of produce in farmers' markets to be acceptable or highly acceptable. The favorite items purchased in the Louisiana farmers' markets were tomatoes, sweet corn, and string beans. The morning hours of Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays were indicated as preferred shopping times.

In the Missouri study, respondents ranked product quality, variety, and lower price as the top factors drawing them to farmers' markets. Friendliness and atmosphere were the next most frequently mentioned advantages. Consumer dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the Missouri farmers' markets centered on the automobile--heavy traffic and inadequate parking. Despite such complaints, 95 percent of the respondents said they wanted direct marketing of farm produce to be encouraged in the future. Missouri vendors were generally satisfied with such markets as an outlet for their products. These markets provided a means

of improving their income with minor expenses (small rental and utility charges were the only costs to vendors). Those complaints voiced mainly related to inadequate facilities and promotion--vendors wanted more publicity and advertising to attract both customers and other vendors.

A telephone survey of 500 randomly selected households in Minnesota during the summer of 1976 revealed that, during 1975, 35 percent of the respondents had purchased food from a roadside stand. Over 13 percent also had bought food from a pick-your-own operation, and 6 percent had made purchases at a farmers' market (4).

The nationwide survey of 2,500 consumers conducted by the Agriculture Council of America (1) reveals that 79 percent of the consumers felt that "the interests of farmers and consumers are similar enough to warrant joint action." A large majority of the respondents to this survey also said they were dissatisfied with food prices, and 90 percent saw direct farmer-to-consumer marketing as a possibility for cutting costs. As one respondent put it, "Direct farmer-to-consumer marketing is the only way to lower food prices."

None of these studies of consumer attitudes and opinions about direct marketing are based on a representative sample of the entire Nation. However, the findings do provide some insight as to the satisfaction derived from, or perceived to exist in, direct marketing by a portion of the population.

THE FUTURE OF DIRECT MARKETING

Farmer-to-consumer sales are encouraged in numerous ways. The Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 offers financial aid, educational programs, and technical assistance in forming direct marketing outlets. Thirty-nine States submitted a total of 44 proposals for direct-marketing projects which might be funded under the Direct Marketing Act. For fiscal year 1977, eight States were awarded funds for projects, including Arizona, Florida, Georgia and South Carolina jointly, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, and New York. The projects range from a joint Georgia-South Carolina direct-marketing effort aimed at low-income consumers and limited-resource farmers, to a New Jersey educational film production for presentation to both producer and consumer groups. Additional States are expected to receive funds under the Direct Marketing Act in fiscal year 1978.

Some States, notably New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, and conduct annual conferences which facilitate the sharing of information among producers, consumers, and others concerning the establishment and operation of direct-marketing outlets. Such conferences will continue in years to come.

During the summer of 1976, California's Department of Food and Agriculture sponsored a clearinghouse for surplus tree fruits, especially cling peaches, pears, and apricots. The clearinghouse used toll-free telephone numbers to put potential customers directly in contact with farmers who had unsold produce available. All details regarding quantities and prices were worked out between individual farmers and consumers.

Conservative estimates place sales via the clearinghouse at 1,350 tons. The apparent success of the California clearinghouse experiment might lead to its becoming a permanent feature of direct marketing, not only in California but in other States as well. Many very small or part-time farmers may still need to somehow pool their production, through a cooperative or some similar arrangement, in order to be a factor in direct marketing of any sort.

If enthusiasm shown at the State level can carry direct marketing into the lives of more producers and more consumers, then farmer-to-consumer marketing has a promising future.

REFERENCES

(1) Agriculture Council of America, "Survey Shows Consumers Ready to Work with Farmers." News release, Feb. 18, 1977.

(2) American Vegetable Grower, "How Big is the Roadside Market Industry?" Vol. 25, No. 2, Feb. 1977.

(3) Collins, Arthur Jeffery, Missouri Farmers' Retail Markets: Overview of a Marketing Alternative. Master's Thesis, Univ. Mo., May 1977.

(4) Kinnucan, Henry and Ben Sexauer, "Consumers Find Alternative Food Sources in Minnesota." Minnesota Agricultural Economist. Univ. Minn., June 1977.

(5) Roy, Ewell P., Don Leary and Jerry M. Law, Customer Evaluation of Farmers' Markets in Louisiana, DAE Research Report No. 516. Dept. Agr. Econ. and Agribus., La. State Univ., Mar. 1977.

(6) Washington Post, "To Market, To Market, To Buy Almost Anything." June 12, 1977.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arkansas

University of Arkansas, Roadside Market Stand. College of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Agriculture, cooperating.

Colorado

Marby, Gerry, 1972 Roadside Peach Trade Study of Direct Sales to Consumer. Tri River Area Extension Service, 1972.

Delaware

Cantaloupes-A Boom to Roadside Sales.

University of Delaware, Ground Covers. Delaware Agricultural Extension Service, 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., Advantages, Problems, and Suggestions For Pick-Your-Own Marketing of Horticultural Products. University of Delaware, Agricultural Extension Service, 1970.

Ginder, Roger A., Bedding Plants-A Timely Possibility For Roadside Markets. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service.

Ginder, Roger A., "Cash Management In Your Market," Roadside Market News, No. 13. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Aug. 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., "Certified Roadside Market Association," "Roadside Market Pricing Policies," "Unit vs. Multiple Pricing Policies," "Roadside Markers Can Make A Good Excuse," Roadside Market News, No. 10. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, May 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., Choosing The Correct Advertising Media For Your Market. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., "Fall-Capitalize On It," "Ecology Price Cards For Christmas Trees," "Plan Ahead For Tax Time," Roadside Market News, No. 21. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Sept. 1972.

Ginder, Roger A., Flying Insect Control For Roadside Markets.

Ginder, Roger A., "How Cost Control Can Affect Your Profit," Roadside Market News, No. 11. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, June 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., How To Apply The Correct Mark-up System To Your Merchandise.

Ginder, Roger A., "Long Range Planning And Your Business," Roadside Market News, No. 8. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Oct. 1970.

Ginder, Roger A., "National Apple Week," "Fresh Fruits For Snacks," "Bulletin Boards For Local Activities," "Is Your Insurance Adequate For Your Business?," Roadside Market News, No. 14. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Sept. 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., "Policies Help In Clerk Training", Roadside Market News, No. 18. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, May 1972.

Ginder, Roger A., Pricing Your Merchandise.

Ginder, Roger A., "Retirees A Source Of Part-Time Labor," "Check List For High Volume Days," Roadside Market News, No. 12. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, July 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., "Some Novel Ideas For Attracting Attention To Your Market," Roadside Market News, No. 4. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, 1970.

Ginder, Roger A., "Some Tips On Roadsigns For Your Market," Roadside Market News, No. 6. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Aug. 1970.

Ginder, Roger A., "Spring Repairs," "Pesticide Tolerance," "Orderly Parking," "Bedding Plant Trade Association," Roadside Market News, No. 9. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Apr. 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., "Springtime Tasks For The Roadside Market," Roadside Market News, No. 16. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Mar. 1972.

Ginder, Roger A., "Tax Management," "Locating Christmas Trees For Your Market," "Blueprints For Roadside Market Structures Available," Roadside Market News, No. 22. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Oct. 1972.

Ginder, Roger A., "Watch For Income Tax Changes And How They Will Affect Your Business," Roadside Market News, No. 15. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Oct. 1971.

Ginder, Roger A., "What About The 4 Day 40 Hour Week?," Roadside Market News, No. 19. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, June 1972.

Ginder, Roger A., "With Sweet Corn Freshness Is The Key," Roadside Market News, No. 20. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Aug. 1972.

Informative Advertising-A Prospect Worth Considering.

Milmoe, James J., Farm Roadside Marketing In The United States. University of Delaware, Food Business Institute, 1965.

Roadside Market News, "Profile Of Roadside Market Shoppers." University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service.

Psychological Principles For Roadside Marketing.

Southern Corn Leaf Blight And Sweet Corn.

Stevens, Robert F., "Cultural Practices," Roadside Market News, No. 9. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Apr. 1971.

Stevens, Robert F., "Cultural Practices," Roadside Market News, No. 11. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, May 1971.

Stevens, Robert F., "Fall Is Fruit Time For The Roadside Stand," Roadside Market News, No. 6. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Aug. 1970.

Stevens, Robert F., "Fall Sales Of Plants," "Care Of Nursery Stock," "Bark Mulch-Does It Harbor Termites?", "Mulches-How To Best Use Them And Which Are The Best?", "Nuts," Roadside Market News, No. 20. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Aug. 1972.

Stevens, Robert F., "Farm And Home Field Day," "Using Local Production," "Plan Ahead," "Greenhouse Tomatoes For June Profitable This Year," Roadside Market News, No. 19. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, June 1972.

Stevens, Robert F., "Field Day-August 11, 1971", "Left Over Nursery Stock," "New Plant Pathologist," "Ralph Now Substation Director-Is Replaced By Windsor," Roadside Market News, No. 12. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, July 1971.

Stevens, Robert F., "Field Day-August 12, 1971," "Varieties of Summer Fruits," "Dried Flowers For Fall," "More On Corn Blight," Roadside Market News, No. 11. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, June 1971.

Stevens, Robert F., "Pod Picker Demonstration," "'Petite Sweet' Watermelon," "Ground Covers For September Sales," "New Hollyhock," "Summer Festival," Roadside Market News, No. 13. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Aug. 1971.

Stevens, Robert F., Pumpkins.

Stevens, Robert F., "Season Late For Produce," "Vegetables In Containers," "Gourds For Fall Sales," "Unusual Vegetables Attract Customers," "Bedding Plants For Shore Properties," Roadside Market News, No. 18. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, May 1972.

Stevens, Robert F., "Terrariums," "Bitter Pit Of Apples," "Potted Hollies For Christmas," Roadside Market News, No. 22. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Oct. 1972.

Stevens, Robert F., "Timely Notes," Roadside Market News, No. 8. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Oct. 1970.

Stevens, Robert F., "Tomatoes In Trenches," "Chemical Weed Control In The Home Garden," "Materials For Drying Flowers," "Mulches," "Supplies For The Organic Gardener," Roadside Market News, No. 17. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Apr. 1972.

Stevens, Robert F., "Weed Control For Strawberries," "Seedling Trees For Spring Sales," "A New Christmas Tree Association For Delaware," "Greenhouse Tomatoes," "Seedling Trees," "Potted Christmas Trees," Roadside Market

News, No. 14. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Sept. 1971.

Stevens, Robert F., "Weed Control In Christmas Trees," "Presto Tomato Is Early," "Plants Sell Through The Summer," "Changing Market Conditions Deserve Consideration," Roadside Market News, No. 23. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, June 1972.

Sweet Corn Quality.

Roadside Market News, "The Importance Of Your Market Building Layout," No. 7. University of Delaware, Cooperative Extension Service, Sept. 1970.

Georgia

Georgia Department of Agriculture, Rules Of The Roadside Marketing Incentive Program, Chapter 40-17-1. Division of Markets.

Indiana

Blakeley, Ransom A., Indiana Farm Market News. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Inventory Management For Garden Centers. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Packaging And Displays For Roadside Marketing. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Parking Area Design For Farm Markets. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Preparation And Use Of Signs In Roadside Marketing. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Retail Nursery Layout. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Roadside Market Layout. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Sign Design Analysis. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Some Conclusions On Sign Design. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., Suggestions For A Beginning In Roadside Marketing. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Blakeley, Ransom A., U-Pick Management. Purdue University, Department of Horticulture.

Greene, Mark R., Insurance And Risk Management For Small Business, condensed by R. A. Blakeley. Purdue University, Horticulture Department.

Indiana Farm Fresh Markets, Inc. Indiana Farm Fresh Market. Centerville.

Matthew, David L., and Charles Williams, Insect Control At The Farm Market. Purdue University, Department of Entomology.

Porter, John T., A Management Account And Tax Record Guide For Road Side Markets, Fruit Stores, Garden Centers, And Nurseries, Ec. 303. Purdue University, Cooperative Extension Service, July 1965.

Kentucky

Davis, Hubert W., and Harold G. Love, Roadside Marketing In Kentucky. University of Kentucky, Agricultural and Home Economics Extension Service.

Love, Harold G., Site Location Strategy And Methods For Supermarkets And Fast Food Stores. University of Kentucky, College of Agriculture.

Maine

Erhardt, Wilfred H., Commerical Newsletter, No. 25A. University of Maine, Cooperative Extension Service, 1969.

Erhardt, Wilfred H., "Vegetable News," Commercial Newsletter, No. 34. University of Maine, Cooperative Extension Service, 1970.

Erhardt, Wilfred H., Commercial Newsletter, No. 45. University of Maine, Cooperative Extension Service, 1970.

Erhardt, Wilfred H., Commercial Newsletter, No. 47. University of Maine, Cooperative Extension Service, 1971.

Erhardt, Wilfred H., Commercial Newsletter, No. 54. University of Maine, Cooperative Extension Service, 1972.

Maryland

By-Laws Of Maryland Certified Farmers Roadside Market Association.

Fabian, Morris S., Opportunities In Roadside Marketing. University of Maryland, Cooperative Extension Service.

Hoecker, Harold H., 1972 Buyer's Guide To Maryland Farm Fresh Vegetables. University of Maryland, Cooperative Extension Service.

Hoecker, Harold H., Pick Your Own Fruits And Vegetables In Maryland. University of Maryland, Cooperative Extension Service.

Hoecker, Harold H., Roadside Marketing. University of Maryland, Cooperative Extension Service, 1967.

Hoecker, Harold H., and Glenn J. Stadelbacher. 1972 Buyer's Guide To Maryland Farm Fresh Fruit. University of Maryland, Cooperative Extension Service.

Partial List Of Marketing Information-1973.

Symposium of Extension Programs On Direct To Consumer Marketing. 1973.

University of Maryland, Facts About Your Food. Cooperative Extension Service.

University of Maryland, Proceedings-Second Annual Conference On Roadside Marketing. Complied by Harold H. Hoecker. Department of Agricultural Economics, Mar. 1969.

Massachusetts

Marini, Dominic, Walter Melnick, and R. Alden Miller, Methods of Handling Sweetcorn. University of Massachusetts.

Miller, R. Alden, Northeast Region Marketing Letter, No. 1. University of Massachusetts, Cooperative Extension Service, June 1972.

Miller, R. Alden, Northeast Region Marketing Letter, No. 2. University of Massachusetts, Cooperative Extension Service, Sept. 1972.

Miller, R. Alden, Northeast Region Marketing Letter, No. 3. University of Massachusetts, Cooperative Extension Service, Nov. 1972.

Report From Roadside Market Task Force To Northeast Extension Marketing Committee. Morris Fabian, chairman.

University of Massachusetts, A Survey Of Roadside Stand Customers In Massachusetts. Organized by David A. Storey. College of Agriculture, 1969.

Michigan

Antle, Glen G., Market Tips. Michigan State University, Cooperative Extension Service, 1971.

Antle, Glen G., Pick Your Own. Michigan State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Meldrum, Maryanne, and Mary Zehner, Consumer Attitudes Towards Shopping At Roadside Markets. Michigan State University, Department of Agricultural Economics, 1969.

Nevada

A Market Feasibility.

By-Laws Of Southern Nevada Agricultural Producers.

Capital Requirements.

Membership Agreement.

Revolving Fund Plan-S.N.A.P. June 1972.

New Hampshire

Weeks, Silas B., Managing The Roadside Farm Stand For Profit. University of New Hampshire, Cooperative Extension Service, 1961.

Whippin, Norman F., Roadside Selling In New Hampshire. University of New Hampshire, Cooperative Extension Service, 1957.

New Jersey

Fabian, Morris S., Opportunities In Roadside Marketing. Rutgers University, Cooperative Extension Service, 1962.

New Jersey Crop Reporting Service, New Jersey Roadside Market Survey 1966. New Jersey Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1967.

New Jersey Crop Reporting Service, New Jersey Roadside Market Directory 1967. New Jersey Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1967.

New Jersey Roadside Market Conference, Proceedings Of A Conference, 1969-74.

Perkins, Frederick A., Marketing Starr Apples In New Jersey. Rutgers University, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, 1962.

Rutgers University, Pick-Your-Own Farms In New Jersey. Compiled by Frederick A. Perkins. Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing, Cooperative Extension Service, Cook College, 1973.

Sherrare, Nelson E., Jersey Certified Market News, Vol. IV, No. 2. New Jersey Certified Farm Markets, Inc.

New Mexico

New Mexico State University, Research Report 274. Agricultural Experiment Station, 1974.

New York

Eiler, Doyle A., and David G. Rosenfeld, Customers At Selected New York State Roadside Markets. Cornell University, Department of Agricultural Economics, 1973.

North Carolina

North Carolina Farm Markets, Inc., Proceedings Of First Annual Meeting. 1972.

Proctor, E.A., A Checklist For Roadside Produce Stand Operators. North Carolina State University, Agricultural Extension Service, 1963.

Ohio

Bennett, Thomas A., M.E. Cravens, and J.E. Jeffries, Retail Farm Marketing In Northeast Ohio. Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, 1967.

Bennett, Thomas A., M.E. Cravens, and J. Mitchell Lynd, A Case Study Of Roadside Market Clientele. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, 1965.

Burnham, Bruce O., and M.E. Cravens, A Business Analysis of 17 Farm Roadside Markets In Ohio. Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, 1967.

Cravens, M.E., and J.E. Jeffries, Analysis of Roadside Marketing In Franklin County, Ohio. Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, 1963.

Cravens, M.E., and J.E. Jeffries, A Review Of Roadside Marketing Literature. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, 1964.

Cravens, M.E. and Melvin W. Smith, Retail Farmers' Markets As A Means Of Direct Sales To Customers. Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, 1962.

Pennsylvania

Brewer, Thomas A., and James S. Toothman. Direct Marketing "Tips." Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service, 1973.

Care of Fresh Vegetables, Care Of Fresh Fruits.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Method Of Sale Of Produce In Pennsylvania. Bureau of Standard Weights and Measures.

Farm and Home News, "Food Preservation." 1972.

Pennsylvania State University, "Guidelines For Retailing Bedding Plants," Direct Marketing "Tips." Cooperative Extension Service.

Porter, C.W., Guidelines To Successful Roadside Marketing. Pennsylvania State University, College of Agriculture.

Toothman J.S., "A Checklist For Developing Your Market Sales And Operating Plan," Direct Marketing "Tips." Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman J.S., "An Outline For Informing Employees Of Basic Policies And Rules Pertaining To Their Employment," Direct Marketing "Tips." Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman J.S., Guide For Handling Customer Contacts. Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman J.S., Guidelines For Building Profits From The Sale Of Fresh Fruits And Vegetables. Pennsylania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman, J.S., "How Do You Rate As A Leader?", Direct Marketing "Tips." Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman, J.S., Jug Store Management Information-Some Measures Of Merchandising Productivity. Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman, J.S., "Market Condition Checklist," Direct Marketing "Tips." Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman, J.S., Measures Of Retail Merchandising And Operating Performance. Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Toothman, J.S., "Steps In Hiring, Training, And Supervising Roadside Market Clerks," Direct Marketing "Tips." Pennsylvania State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

South Carolina

Brown, E. Evan, Roadside Marketing In South Carolina. South Carolina, Agricultural Experiment Station, 1957.

Brown, E. Evan, and Fred W. Chapman, Jr., Factors Affecting Roadside Market Sales. Clemson Agricultural College, 1958.

Harrelson, William L., The Roadside Market Incentive Program In South Carolina. Department of Agriculture.

Hite, J.S., Palmetto Economics. Clemson University, Cooperative Extension Service.

McLeod, Reuel, South Carolina Roadside Market News. Department of Agriculture, 1973.

Tennessee

Bird, J.J., Pick-Your-Own Fruits and Vegetables. University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service, 1970.

Texas

Powell, Gordon R., Fruit and Vegetable Marketing. Texas A&M University, Texas Agricultural Extension Service, 1966.

Texas A&M University, Roadside Marketing. Texas Agricultural Extension Service.

Virginia

Bell, James B., Roadside Marketing. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Agricultural Extension Service, 1965.

Wisconsin

Klingheil, George C., Pick-Your-Own Strawberries-the ten P's to profit. University of Wisconsin-Extension, University of Wisconsin-Madison, cooperative extension programs.

Wisconsin Department of Agriculture. Marketing Division, Pick-Your-Own Strawberries.

Wisconsin Roadside Marketing, Fifth Conference. 1970.

Wisconsin Roadside Marketing Association. Wisconsin Roadside Shopping Guide. Farm Bureau Marketing Association.

Nova Scotia

Embree, C.G., "Apples," Roadside Marketing. Department of Agriculture.

Embree, C.G., "Plums," Roadside Marketing. Department of Agriculture.

Embree, C.G., "Sweet Corn," Roadside Marketing. Department of Agriculture.

Sebley, Jack D., Choosing A Location For A Roadside Market. 1972.

Sebley, Jack D., Interior Layout Of A Roadside Market. 1972.

Sebley, Jack D., Parking. 1972

Sebley, Jack D., Pricing At Roadside Markets. 1972.

Sebley, Jack D., Roadside Marketing In Nova Scotia. Department of Agriculture, 1972.

Ontario-Canada

Ontario Roadside Marketing Conference, Proceedings Of The Conference. 1970.

Ontario Roadside Marketing Conference, Proceedings Of The Conference. 1971.

Ontario Roadside Marketing Conference, Proceedings Of The Conference. 1972.

Ontario Roadside Marketing Conference, Proceedings Of The Conference. 1973.

Vandenberg, John, Marketing Notes. Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Soils and Crops Branch, Apr. 1973.

Vandenberg, John, Marketing Notes. Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Soils and Crops Branch, May 1973.

Vandenberg, John, Marketing Notes. Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Soils and Crops Branch, July 1973.

Vandenberg, John, Marketing Notes. Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Soils and Crops Branch, Aug. 1973.

Puerto Rico

Alvarado, Livio Lefebre, La Venta De Productos Agricolas A Orillas De Carreteras. (Roadside Marketing For Agricultural Products). Agricultural Extension Service, 1969.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE
AGR 101
THIRD CLASS

U.S. MAIL

4821 USNACU A422 18C03 0003
USDA NAL CURRENT SERIAL RECC-
RD
BELTSVILLE MD 20012
X