Firms B and F packed celery directly from the sorting chain into the packing crates. Of the crates packed by firm B, almost 93 percent were packed correctly. None of the other firms had a higher percentage of their crates packed correctly. Firm F required about half the time it took others to sort and pack celery, yet only three out of the 14 other firms had as high a percentage of the crates packed correctly, and one of those (firm B) was also using the direct packing method. Firm J used the most labor for sorting and packing (Table 32) and had the lowest proportion of their crates packed correctly. On occasion when the quantity of certain sizes was limited, firms G, I and J followed the practice of using two packers for one sorter. The packers, therefore, had much excessive time on their hands. In spite of this, all three of the firms had far below average accuracy of pack.

The accuracy of the pack tends to be increased as the time available for packing decreases. This does not necessarily hold true between firms using the same method. Actual hours of labor per 10,000 stalks were obtained for nine of the 15 firms. The time used by the other seven can be judged by the system used.[15]

The lowest accuracy as to pack was obtained by those firms which used one sorter for each packer but on occasions used one sorter to two packers. The belief was held that one packer could not simultaneously pack two sizes accurately. Actually higher accuracy was obtained. The packer did not switch from one size of celery to another before completely filling one crate. While one crate was being packed, the celery for the other size was allowed to accumulate on the table. The packer, therefore, was able to work at a constant rate with no loss in accuracy. The packers with a large amount of idle time on their hands had more chance to lose count of the layers or stalks.

From the data obtained in this study, the common assumption that the same worker, sorting and packing, will lose count is certainly not valid. The error in this assumption probably arises from the fact that packers do not mentally count each stalk. The motions of packing soon become more or less automatic. When so many cycles have been completed, the worker, as a matter of course, begins another layer. Close observation of the packers of firms B and F revealed that when there was an odd number of stalks to the layer, the layer was started by

[15] See Table 1 of Appendix C.