

## California Avocado Association 1935 Yearbook \20: 58-59

### Calavo Growers of California Variety Marketability Ratings

Variety	September 30, 1935					
	Rating as to Eating & Keeping Quality		Rating as to all factors: Eating & Keeping Quality, Appearance, Present & Future Salability			
	1934-35	1934-35	1933-34	1932-33	1931-32	1930-31
Fuerte .....	98	98	99	99	99	99
Queen .....	87	76	73	75	77	76
Nabal .....	86	84	87	84	84	78
Puebla .....	82	81	86	78	82	85
Benik .....	80	69	70	70	70	72
Murrieta Green.....	72	75	78	76	75	69
Lyon .....	72	73	70	74	75	79
Colorado .....	71	65	65	70	67	64
Verde .....	70	73	65	68	67	63
Dickey-A .....	70	66	62	63	66	64
Sharpless .....	68	66	70	72	71	73
Taft .....	65	62	75	77	77	77
Dickinson .....	62	55	59	57	59	53
Challenge .....	61	62	64	63	61	64
Prince .....	59	60	57	64	59	....
Carlsbad .....	58	58	59	60	....	....
Princess .....	55	56	51	64	54	....
Anaheim .....	50	57	58	57	60	61
Linda .....	....	....	59	59	66	66
Dickey .....	....	....	58	54	52	55
Worsham .....	....	....	58	58	56	53
Blakeman .....	....	....	57	59	58	49
Cantel .....	....	....	55	58	....	....
Thinskins .....	....	....	55	59	61	62
Kashlan .....	....	....	53	....	....	....
Stephens Choice.....	....	....	53	71	....	....
Cabnal .....	....	....	50	60	....	....
Premier .....	....	....	50	55	42	42
Spinks .....	....	....	50	45	44	48
Panchoy .....	....	....	49	50	50	49
Itzamna .....	....	....	48	50	52	49
Perfecto .....	....	....	48	44	40	42
Ward .....	....	....	47	44	50	50
Dutton .....	....	....	41	31	44	44
Mayapan .....	....	....	37	32	37	39

The five columns on the right-hand side show the marketability ratings from 1931 to 1935 inclusive, based on all five factors—eating quality, keeping quality, appearance, present salability and future salability.

The column headed "Rated as to eating and keeping quality" is a new departure this year. It was developed to tie in with qualification for "Calavo" rating. It does not take into consideration the three other factors— appearance and present and future salability. It was felt that the quality yardstick consisted of eating and keeping qualities—that these were the inherent goodness the consumer expected when buying "Calavo." Appearance is, of course, no index as to the goodness or poorness of fruit itself. The consumer cannot eat "looks." The other two factors, present salability and future salability are matters of opinion and can, to some extent, be controlled by the sales staff. Eating and keeping quality cannot be tampered with—if the fruit is good to eat and keeps until it reaches the consumer—that is what determines whether it shall go "Calavo" or not. The

number of varieties listed on this year's questionnaires is limited to 18, compared with 36 last year. The 18 varieties include the 14 that were on the "Calavo" list last year, and 4 others which some of the members think should be on the "Calavo" list. Prince and Carlsbad were just under the 60 point deadline set by the Board for "Calavo" rating.

An interesting part of this season's questionnaires was the proportion of the trade recommending "Calavo" on the different varieties. Of the present "Calavo" varieties, trade recommendations for "Calavo" rating ranged from 100% on Puerte to 61% on Challenge—that is, each and every individual answering the questionnaires recommended "Calavo" on Puerte and so on down the line to Challenge, on which 61% of those answering recommended "Calavo." Immediately there was a wide gap for on Prince, the highest rating candidate for Calavo, only 28% of those answering felt it should go "Calavo." Only 2% of those answering the questionnaires recommended Anaheim under "Calavo."

All of the varieties omitted from this year's questionnaire list were left out because:

- (1) The consistency of the previous four years' reports made this year's possible answers a foregone conclusion. It would have been a waste of time asking for reports on Mayapan, for instance, when it has never rated above 39, or
- (2) The variety was decreasing in production and therefore becoming of less importance.