Journal of Economics and Public Finance
ISSN 2377-1038 (Print) ISSN 2377-1046 (Online)
Vol. 11, No. 2, 2025
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/jepf

Original Paper

A Review of Patterns of Competitive Dynamics in Twenty-Four U.S. Consumer Markets

Part I: The Food Group--Discretionary

Y. Datta[1*]

[1] Professor Emeritus, Northern KY University, Highland Heights, KY 41099, USA

[*] Y. Datta, Professor Emeritus, Northern KY University, Highland Heights, KY 41099, USA

Abstract

This appraisal is an attempt to review the patterns of competitive dynamics in twenty-four U.S. consumer markets. These markets can be divided into five broad categories:

- *Food Group--Discretionary (2) Food Group—Non-Discretionary (3) Personal Grooming (4) Personal Hygiene (5a) Laundry and Dishwashing Detergents, and (5b) Household Cleaning and Alkaline AA Battery.*

This paper covers four markets in the Food Group—Discretionary category.

Keywords

U.S. Beer market, U.S. Cola Carbonated Beverage market, Non-Cola—Lemon-Lime Carbonated Beverage market, Potato Chip market.

1. Introduction

The genesis of this research goes back to my paper: *"Market Segmentation: An Integrated Framework."* It took me *four* long years after I submitted it for consideration towards publication, to finally get it published. This is because it challenged conventional wisdom (Datta, 1996).

Every market has *two* sides: demand and supply, customers and suppliers. It is only when the two sides *interact* that a market develops. While this meaning of the term 'market' is widely accepted, marketers and strategists have traditionally adopted a rather *limited* view that is *demand*-oriented. They define market segmentation in terms of *customers*—with a focus on 'people' characteristics, e.g., demographics, social class. An opposite view, which may be called 'product' segmentation, is *supply*-oriented which *starts* with *product* characteristics, e.g., quality, price (*ibid*).

Barnett (1969) points out that the traditional marketing approach to market segmentation has not been very successful. So, he suggests an alternative that is more promising: one which *shifts* the primary focus *from* "*whom* you reach" to "*what* characteristics you build into the product" (*ibid*, *italics* added).

Thus, we need an *integrated* approach to market segmentation which includes *both* the demand and supply sides of the competitive equation, and where 'people' [customer] and 'product' characteristics are *not* mutually exclusive paths to market segmentation, but, rather, two sides of the *same* coin (*ibid*).

The basic premise of this article is that the *product* characteristics approach is both *easier* and a more *actionable* way of looking at how a market is—or can be—segmented than the traditional marketing approach. It focuses *both* on customer benefits or needs *and* the *resources* necessary to satisfy them (*ibid*).

Similarly, I had a great deal of difficulty to get another paper of mine published because it charted a *new* direction. And that paper was: *"A Critique of Porter's cost leadership and differentiation strategies"* (Datta, 2010a). In that paper I have argued that the path to market share leadership does *not* lie in lower price founded in *cost leadership* strategy, as Michael Porter (1980) suggests. Rather, it is based on the premise—according to the PIMS database research (Note 1)—that it is *customer*-perceived quality that is crucial to long-term competitive position and profitability. So, the answer to market share leadership for a business is to *differentiate* itself by offering quality *better* than that of the nearest competition (Datta, 2010a).

To make this idea *operational* requires *two* steps. The *first* is to determine *which* price-quality segment to compete in? Most consumer markets can be divided in three *basic* price-quality segments: *premium*, *mid-price*, and *economy*. These can be extended to *five* by adding two more: *ultra-premium* and *ultra-economy* (Datta, 1996).

The answer lies in serving the *middle* class by competing in the *mid-price* segment (Datta, 2010a, 2010b).

As my next article discovered (Datta, 2011), the *middle class* represents about 40% of households in America (Table 1). It is also the segment that Procter & Gamble (P&G), the largest American multinational corporation, has successfully served in the past (Datta, 2010b).

The *second* step for a business seeking market share leadership is to *position* itself at a price that is *somewhat* higher than that of the nearest competition (Datta, 1996, 2010a, 2010b).

This is in accord with P&G's practice based on the idea that although higher quality does deserve a "price premium," it should *not* be excessive (Datta, 2010b). A higher price offers *two* advantages: (1) It promotes an *image* of quality, and (2) It ensures that the strategy is both profitable and sustainable in the *long run* (*ibid*).

A classic example of price positioning is provided by General Motors (GM). In 1921 GM rationalized its product line by offering "a car for every purse and purpose"—from Chevrolet to Pontiac, to Oldsmobile, to Buick, to Cadillac. More importantly, GM *positioned* each car line at the *top* of its segment (Datta, 1996, 2010a).

A more recent and familiar example is the *economy* chain, Motel 6, which has positioned itself as "offering the *lowes*t price of any national chain" (Datta, 2012).

Another example is the Fairfield Inn. When Marriott introduced this chain, it targeted it at the *economy* segment. And then it positioned Fairfield at the *top* of that segment (Datta, 1996, 2010b).

As mentioned above, *customer*-perceived quality is the most important factor contributing to the long-term success of a business. However, quality *cannot* really be separated from price (Datta, 1996). Quality, in general, is an intricate, multi-dimensional concept that is difficult to comprehend. So, consumers often use *relative* price—and a brand's *reputation*—as a symbol of quality (Datta, 2010b).

The *third* paper, *complementing* the above two--and completing the *circle*--was my article: *"Rising Economic Inequality and Class Divisions in America--A Socio-economic Class Lifestyle Profile."* Whereas my previous two papers focused largely on "product" characteristics of market segmentation, this paper, in contrast, looked at "*people*" characteristics, e.g., demographics like *income*, and sociographics like *social class* (Datta, 2011).

In this paper I have shown that America is a deeply-divided nation, refuting the *myth*, long perpetuated by Conservatives, that America is a classless society (*ibid*).

Income inequality in America has been going up unrelentingly for 45 years from 1974 to 2018, *squeezing* the middle class. It has now widened so much that it *rivals* the highest level recorded in 1928 that led to the Great Depression of 1929 (Datta, 2022, 2011).

The socio-economic *lifestyle* profile of America reveals *three* broad income groups, giving rise to *six* social classes. More importantly, the six social classes are *not* merely a statistical construct, but rather a picture of *reality* (*ibid*).

Contrary to popular belief, the upper class does *not* consist of the top 1% earners: but rather the top 0.5%, with the *Upper Middle Class* occupying the 80-99.5th percentile (Table 1; Datta, 2022, 2011).

Finally, thanks to the extraordinary *generosity* of A.C. Nielson Co., I was extremely fortunate to get the invaluable U.S. *national* retail sales data of the following 24 markets for 2008 and 2007, without which this entire research campaign would *not* have been possible:

- Men's Shaving Cream, Beer, Shampoo, Shredded/Grated Cheese, Refrigerated Orange Juice, Men's Razor-Blades, Women's Razor-Blades, Toothpaste, Canned Soup, Coffee, Potato Chip, Alkaline AA Battery, Facial Tissue, Toilet Paper, Paper Towel, Disposable Diapers, Sanitary Pads, Automatic-Dishwasher Detergent, Hand-Dishwashing Detergent, Household Liquid Non-Disinfectant Cleaner, Heavy-Duty Liquid Laundry Detergent, Deodorant, Cola Carbonated Beverage, and Non-Cola--Lemon-Lime Regular Carbonated Beverage.

For each of these 24 markets, I used Hierarchical Cluster Analysis to test two hypotheses: (I) That the market leader is likely to compete in the *mid-price* segment and (II) That its unit price is likely to be *higher* than that of the nearest competition (Note 2).

These markets can be divided into five broad categories:

- (1) Food Group--Discretionary (2) Food Group—Non-Discretionary (3) Personal Grooming (4) Personal Hygiene (5a) Laundry and hand Dishwashing Detergents, and (5b) Household Cleaning and Alkaline AA Battery.

A summary of the results of this extensive research is presented in Table 2.

So, this appraisal is an attempt to review the *patterns* of competitive dynamics in the above *twenty-four* U.S. consumer markets.

This review will be divided into *six* projects:

Part I—The Food Group—Discretionary

- The U.S. Beer Market
- The U.S. Cola Carbonated Beverage Market
- The U.S. Non-Cola--Lemon-Lime Regular Carbonated Beverage Market
- The U.S. Potato Chip Market

Part II-- The Food Group—Non-Discretionary

- The U.S. Coffee Market
- The U.S. Canned Soup Market
- The U.S. Shredded/Grated Cheese Market
- The U.S. Refrigerated Orange Juice Market

Part III—Personal Grooming

- The U.S. Shampoo Market
- The U.S. Toothpaste Market
- The U.S. Men's Razor-Blades Market
- The U.S. Women's Razor-Blades Market
- The U.S. Men's Shaving Cream Market

Part IV—Personal Hygiene

- The U.S. Toilet Paper Market
- The U.S. Disposable Diapers Market
- The U.S. Deodorant Market
- The U.S. Sanitary Pads Market

Part Va—Laundry and Dishwashing Detergents

- The U.S. Liquid Heavy-Duty Laundry Detergent Market
- The U.S. Automatic-Dishwasher Detergent Market
- The U.S. Hand-Dishwashing Detergent Market

Part Vb—Household Cleaning and Alkaline AA Battery

- The U.S. Paper Towels Market
- The U.S. Facial Tissue Market
- The U.S. Household Liquid Non-Disinfectant Cleaner Market
- The U.S. Alkaline AA Battery Market

Part VI—An Overview of the Competitive Dynamics of this Research

Part I—The Food Group--Discretionary

A. The U.S. Beer Market

1. Beginning of the U.S. Brewing Industry

The U.S. Beer industry has a *long* history. Its seeds were sown during the middle of the 19th century when a large number of German immigrants arrived in the U.S. and "set about re-creating the pleasures of biergartens they had left behind" (Ogle, 2006, front cover; Datta, 2017).

2. The Founding of Anheuser Busch

It started when Eberhard Anheuser and Adolphus Busch *founded* Anheuser-Busch in the 1850s in St. Louis, Missouri (Datta, 2017).

And just fifty years later, *American*-style lager was the *most* popular beverage, and brewing was the *fifth* largest industry in the country (Ogle, 2006, front cover; Datta, 2017).

3. The Birth of the American Adjunct Pale Lager in 1876

At that time most American brewers were making Bavarian (German) style beer using *six-row* barley. This *all-malt* beer was extremely *rich* in protein. In addition, it was both *unstable* and had a short shelf life (Ogle, 2006, pp. 70-71; Talley, 2017, p. 76; Datta, 2017).

Germans were used to an *overcrowded* land where food was often in *short* supply. So, for centuries Germans and other Europeans thought of beer as *food*: "liquid bread." In contrast, America was a land of plenty with high crop yields, and protein-rich diets (Ogle, 2006, p. 72; Datta, 2017).

Whereas, Germans would nurse a mug of beer for *hours*, Americans just wanted "to *drink*." While the old-world enthusiasts emphasized the *nourishing* qualities of Bavarian beer, Americans drank beer to pass time *pleasantly* in *jovial* company (*ibid*).

Also, the Americans *didn't* like the Bavarian lager because they thought it was "too heavy, too filling, and…too brown" (Ogle, 2006, pp. 72-73; Datta, 2017).

It was Bohemian *pilsner*—pale-- lager from Czech Republic that provided a potential answer to this problem. Anton Schwartz, who had migrated from Bohemia to America, began—along with Dr. John Siebel—experimenting with *malt adjuncts* and publishing their results. Based on their research, they reported that "malt *adjuncts* did *no*t make an inferior beer" (Talley, p. 75; *italics* added).

Thus, Adolphus Busch embarked upon an *adventure* to create an *American* version of Bohemian lager. He expressed a preference for *rice* over corn: because rice--*unlike* corn--hardly contains any oil, and that it imparted *crispness* and *clean* taste to beer (Ogle, 2006, p.75; Datta, 2017).

He *named t*he *American* version of Bohemian lager: *Budweiser*. Thus, thanks to the entrepreneurship of Adolphus Busch, the *first* American Adjunct lager was *born* in 1876 (Ogle, 2006, pp. 75, 78; Datta, 2017).

Budweiser was "yellow (*pale*) in color, with a brilliant sheen, *light*-bodied with a foamy head, and a rich almost creamy flavor." Although it cost *more* than Bavarian all-malt beers, the brewers soon found out that the Americans *liked* the new creation (Ogle, 2006, p. 75; Datta, 2017).

4. Anheuser Busch's "First-to-Market" Strategy a Resounding Success

The path that Adolphous Busch followed in introducing Budweiser may be described as "The First-to-Market" strategy (Ansoff & Stewart, 1967; Datta, 2010b).

This new beer was so successful that it *changed* the face of American brewing for "*all* time and did so almost *overnight*" (Ogle, 2006, p. 78; *italics* added; Datta, 2017)!

The momentous nature of this historic development can be gauged by the fact, that even *today* more than 80% of all beer sold world-wide is the *adjunct pale lager* (Datta, 2017).

5. The U.S. Beer Industry in the 20th Century

The period following WW II witnessed great industry *consolidation*. In 2000 the top-three U.S. breweries were: Anheuser Busch (A-B), Miller, and Coors with a market share, respectively, of 50%, 20%, and 11% (Datta, 2017).

5.1 The Sad Story of Schlitz—The Importance of Quality

In 1970 Schlitz was the number *two* brewer in America. To improve its profitability Schlitz embarked upon a strategy of what Porter (1980) later characterized as *cost leadership* (Datta, 2010a, 2017).

Schlitz's strategy was *three*-pronged: (1) Build new breweries that were *huge*, (2) Devised a new *accelerated* batch- brewing process that *cut down* fermentation from twelve days to *less* than four, (3) To *cut* costs, began using *cheaper* or *artificial* ingredients, replacing barley malt with corn syrup, and using hops *extract* and hops *pellets* instead of fresh hops (Knoedelseder, 2012, p. 116; Datta, 2017).

Soon, it became a darling of *Wall Street* in the brewing industry. *Forbes* magazine reported that in 1973 Schlitz's return on stockholder equity of 21% far exceeded the 13% of A-B. The magazine criticized A-B, and said that the job of top management is to "make money for the *stockholders*" (Knoedelseder, 2012, pp. 116, 127-128, *italics* added; Datta, 2017).

However, this *reckless* pursuit of *cost leadership* strategy led to a serious *erosion* of beer quality that turned out to be *fatal.* In a few years, "the beer that made Milwaukee famous" virtually *disappeared* from the face of this earth (Knoedelseder, 2012, p. 144; Datta, 2017).

6. Americans Switch to Bland Processed Food

A *crucial* change occurred in the first half of the twentieth century. Americans realized that they did not like the idea of their mothers and grandmothers toiling long hours making food in the kitchen. Associating modernity with *convenience,* they gave up flavor *and* nutrition of home-cooked food for bland *processed* food (Ogle, 2006, pp. 228-229; Datta, 2017).

But more a food is processed the more it loses its *flavor*; moreover, processing adds extra *sugar* to food (Ogle, 2006, p. 228; Datta, 2017).

Americans emerged from the War as a nation that had become accustomed to a taste for "*weak*, *over*-extracted percolator coffee." Within the next two decades after WW II, American coffee became even *worse*: from a state of *mediocrity*, coffee went from 'safely middling' to awful" (Pendergrast, p. 236; Datta, 2020c).

A Gallup survey conducted in 1954 projects a consumer preference profile similar to the one we have reported above. The survey found that the eating habits of Americans were "dull." The "overwhelming choice of most Americans for dinner—if cost were no object—was fruit cup, vegetable soup, steak, French fries, and apple pie a' la mode" (Datta, 2011, 2017).

Also, by 1950 class differences were *declining* in clothing, autos, food, and even personal hygiene (*ibid*).

7. From a Mass to a Class Market

In the years 1947-1973 America experienced a sustained period of widespread *prosperity* that are considered the *golden* years of America's *middle* class: an age the U.S. would perhaps never experience again (Datta, 2011, 2022).

By the end of the 1970s American consumers had become *tired* of the *standardized* goods churned out by the nation's vaunted mass-production machine (*ibid*).

This is the time when America had reached a stage where the "era of *bland* food was grinding to a *halt*" (Ogle, 2006, p. 251, *italics* added; Datta, 2017). Symbolizing this trend was the opening in 1971of the first Starbucks which introduced Americans to some of the world's *finest* fresh-roasted *whole* bean coffee: at a *premium* price (Datta, 2017).

The *dramatic* success of Starbucks demonstrated that the consumers were *no* longer content to treat coffee as a run-of-the mill drink—but rather something *special*—that deserved to be *relished* and *savored*, and for which they were willing to pay a *premium* price (Datta, 2020c).

Another notable development in fragmentation of the U.S. mass market was the opening of two major discount chains in 1962—Wal-Mart and K-Mart—that aimed at catering to the *economy* segment (Datta, 2017).

Thus, the mass market of yesterday was fragmenting into a *class* market of today (Datta, 1996, 2011, 2017).

8. Increasing Economic Inequality in America Since 1974

As mentioned earlier, income *inequality* has seen a steady *increase* in America for 45 years from 1974-2018, and by 2007 it *touched* or *exceeded* the lofty heights of 1928 that led to the Great Depression of 1929 (Datta, 2011, 2022).

From 1974 to 2018--the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) grew by what amounted to a yearly average of 2.9%. However, the *median* family income has literally been *stagnant* for almost a half century with a yearly average growth rate of a *mere* 0.6% (Datta, 2022).

Long-term *demographic* changes, triggered by social movements and *changing* social mores, *accentuated* economic inequality (Datta, 2011). An important effect of these *demographic* changes was a *vast* increase in the size of the *Upper Middle Class*.

In 2008 it occupied the 80-99.5th percentile (Datta, 2022, 2017, 2011; Table 1).

9. Profound Influence of the Upper Middle Class over the U.S. Beer Market

In response to competition from the imports, A-B decided in 1966, to *relaunch* Michelob as the *first* national *premium* beer brand (Datta, 1996; also Ogle, 2006, pp. 251-252; Datta, 2017).

The traditional American beer market had *not* changed much since the revolutionary introduction of American Adjunct Pale lager—Budweiser—in 1876.

However, a *major* change occurred in 1967 with the birth of *Light* beer (Datta, 2017).

The *Upper Middle Class* consists mostly of *professionals*. They are more likely to engage in *foreign travel* and have a *cosmopolitan* taste. But, most importantly, their lifestyle and opinions exert considerable *influence* over the entire American society (Datta, 2011).

The *Upper Middle Class* played a *primary* role in giving rise to two *transformative* events in the U.S. Beer industry: the growth of the *import* and *craft* segments (Datta, 2017).

10. The Phenomenal Success of Light Beer

Miller acquired the rights to Meister Brau's *diet* or *low*-calorie beer *Lite* in 1972. During this period, consciousness of *healthy* eating had become *popular*: and with that the demand for beer with *lower* calories (Mosher, 2009, p. 23; Datta, 2017).

As a result, Miller was able to catapult from fourth to *second* place in 1977 (Ogle, 2006, p. 249, p. 283; Datta, 2017).

So spectacular was the growth of this segment that by 2005 light beer production had *surpassed* regular beer (Mosher, 2009, p. 23; Datta, 2017).

11. Growth of Imported Beer

Imports were *less* than one percent of total U.S. beer sales in the 1960s. However, during the first half of the 1970s, imports grew 88%. This was the time when Americans—young baby boomers and *affluent* middle-aged Americans--began to travel to Europe in large numbers. When they returned home, they had developed a taste for *European*-style beers which were being sold at *premium* prices in America (Ogle, 2006, p. 250, pp. 275-276; Datta, 2017).

The "sudden popularity of imports marked the onset of a *transformative* moment" in the history of the American beer industry (Ogle, 2006, p. 251; Datta, 2017).

From a share of just 1% of total U.S. beer sales in the 1960s, imports climbed all the way up to 21% in 2008 (Datta, 2017).

12. The Emergence of Craft Beer and Microbreweries

Another *crucial* development in the beer industry was the emergence of *craf*t beer (Datta, 2017).

12.1 Pioneering Role of Anchor Brewing for Older style of Full-bodied Beer

The introduction of *Steam Beer* by Fritz Maytag's company, Anchor Brewing, in 1965 is generally regarded as the *beginning* of the craft-brewing movement in America (Mosher, 2009, p. 25; Datta, 2017).

Fritz Maytag noticed that many Americans were drinking *imported* beer that cost even *more* than the priciest domestic beer. As such, he targeted his business strategy at this small segment of *discriminating* beer drinkers who were now being served by the imports (Ogle, pp. 264-265; Datta, 2017).

Maytag realized that there was an "audience eager for *authenticity,*" and that the American public was ready for a *new* kind of beer: an "*older* style of *full-bodied*" beer that had not been produced in America for more than a century (Ogle, 2006, p. 265; *italics* added; Datta, 2017).

Maytag's readiness to act on that belief "signaled a *transformative* moment in American brewing" that would *inspire* a *new* generation of brewers (Ogle, 2006, p. 265; *italics* added; Datta, 2017).

13. Globalization and Further Consolidation of the U.S. Beer Industry

Due to A-B's continued domination of the U.S. Beer industry, Philip Morris, the parent of Miller, finally decided to "throw in the towel"—*thirty-one* years after its entry in the market. In 2002 it sold Miller to London-based South African Breweries Ltd (SAB). The new company was to be known as SABMiller (Knoedelseder, 2012, p. 296; Datta, 2017).

After the purchase, SABMiller became the *second* largest brewer behind A-B.

In 2005 Coors, America's *third* largest brewer, merged with Molson, Canada's largest, forming a new company, Molson Coors (Knoedelseder, 2012, p. 298, p. 318; Datta, 2017).

14. Anheuser-Busch Becomes Part of InBev to form AB InBev

In 2008, In-Bev, a four-year old Belgium-based company controlled by three Brazilian billionaires, made a *hostile* take-over bid to acquire Anheuser-Busch. This became the *biggest* cash acquisition in history. As a result, "America had *lost* one of its most beloved companies"—the *last* "freestanding, independent company, still operated by the family that founded it" (Knoedelseder, 2012, p. 3, p. 6; Datta, 2017).

15. U.S. Beer Industry: Price-Quality Segmentation Profile

The U.S. Beer market had net retail sales of $9.5 billion in 2008. Of this *lager* sales were $8,783 million (Datta, 2017).

Based on Hierarchical Cluster Analysis of the lager market, the data supported both Hypothesis I and II for both 2008 and 2007 because Bud Light, the *market leader*, was a member of the *mid-price* segment, with a unit price *higher* than that of Miller Light, the *runner-up* (Datta, 2017).

16. The Role of Promotion

Promotional sales averaged 48% of net lager sales in 2008 (Datta, 2017).

However, a *different* pattern emerges when we look at the promotional scores for smaller vs. larger packs for the leading brands with high lager market share. For example, Bud Light's scores for the 6-pack, 12-pack, and 18-24-30 pack were, respectively, 13%, 40%, and 70%. Similarly, Miller Light's scores were 8%, 38%, and 68% (Datta, 2017).

17. Session Beer: Having a Good Time with Friends

The goal of session beer is to strike a *balance* between *lower* alcohol content and *drinkability*. It is a beer that by the end of the evening one "looks *forward* to repeating the experience again" (Talley, p. xiii, *italics* added; Datta, 2017).

18. American Adjunct Pale Lager the Most Popular Style in America

Perhaps nothing is more important about the popularity of beer than its *color*. And the color that *dominates* the beer world is *pale*—or *pilsner* (Mosher, 2009, p. 3; Datta, 2017).

In 2008 *American Adjunct Light* lager accounted for 55% of sales, while *American Adjunct Regular* lager took a 31% share, adding up to 86% share for the entire Adjunct group (Datta, 2017).

And both are *pale* lagers.

19. The Global Popularity of American Adjunct Pale Lager

Of the 10 best-selling beer brands in the world, *seven* are traditional American Adjunct pale lagers: and three are American brands (Datta, 2017).

B. The U.S. Cola Carbonated Beverage Market

1. Introduction

The U.S. Cola market is a *duopoly* that is dominated by two companies. In 2008, Coca-Cola Co. had a market share of 56% in the regular and diet Cola market, followed by PepsiCo's share of 39%, totaling a 95% share of the Cola market (Datta, 2024f).

2. The Industry Switches from Sugar to Cheaper High Fructose Corn Syrup (HFCS)

The invention of *hybrid corn* F-1 was a breakthrough in agriculture. It was so productive that it could produce 180 bushels of food per acre: compared to just 20 bushels per acre before (Pollan, 2006, p. 31; Datta, 2018b).

Around 1984 the Cola industry switched from sugar to *cheaper* high fructose corn syrup (HFCS).

However, they generally *increased* the *size* of their cola bottles rather than significantly lowering the price of the drink (Note 3).

3. The Coca-Cola Co.

The Coca-Cola Co. is an American multinational corporation founded in 1892. Pharmacist John Pemberton created Coca-Cola in 1886. When Coca-Cola was introduced, it contained *cocaine* from *coca leaves*, and *caffeine* from kola nuts, all of which acted as a *stimulant*. Pemberton adopted the name Coca-Cola for the drink based on its ingredients and that led to its promotion as a "healthy tonic" (Datta, 2024f).

In 1889 the formula and the brand were sold to Asa Griggs Candler who *incorporated* the Coca-Cola Co. in Atlanta in 1892 (*ibid*).

Since it contained a trace of *cocaine,* Coca Cola was sold as an *over-the-counter feel-good* potion. However, sensing that this market was *too small*, the company decided to target the drink to a much *larger* consumer market (Datta, 2024f).

And the rest is history (*ibid*).

So, in 1903, Coca-Cola Co. *removed* cocaine from its formula, leaving caffeine as the only stimulant ingredient. Likewise, it dropped all medicinal claims regarding its cola drink (*ibid*).

The company has kept the *formula* for Coca-Cola as a closely guarded *trade secret* (*ibid*).

Coca-Cola Co. produces *syrup concentrate* which is then sold throughout the world to *bottlers* who hold *exclusive* territories created by the company's *franchise* system (Datta, 2024f).

In 1916, the company introduced the iconic Coca-Cola *contour* bottle to prevent confusion with copycats. Renowned industrial designer Raymond Loewy characterized it as a *design classic.* The bottle has been celebrated in art, music and advertising. Andy Warhol drew the contour bottle to represent *mass culture.* To celebrate the shape of the VW Beatle, Volkswagen compared it to the contour *bottle* (*ibid*).

Early in Coca-Cola's history, the company discovered that, instead of Coca-Cola people were asking for Coke in stores. So, in 1945, the company gave in to the strong desire of its customers and made the nickname Coke as its *trademark* (*ibid*).

4. America Has Some of the World's Highest Rates of Soft Drink Consumption

The United States has some of the highest rates of soft drink consumption in the world. Some of the health risks associated with such high consumption of soda include: diabetes, weight gain, and cavities (Datta, 2024f).

The factors that affect consumption of soft drinks are (*ibid*):

- Young adults are *more* likely to consume soda than adults who are older.
- U.S.-born blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican, or Mexican-Americans are *more* likely to consume soda than whites.
- *Income-poverty* ratio is an important predictor of *frequent* soda consumption.
- *Lower* education is also associated with *higher* consumption of sugary drinks.

5. Sugar, Caffeine, and Carbonation Make Soft Drinks Highly Addictive

Neuroscientists have concluded that the *sugar*, *caffeine*, and *carbonation* of soft drinks are designed to deliver intense and *addictive* experiences that leave you wanting more (Datta, 2024f).

Adults who had become richer did *not* report a drop in consumption of sugary drinks (*ibid*).

One explanation is that although level of wealth and income shape our *early* consumption habits of sugary soft drinks, those habits do *not* change much during adulthood (*ibid*).

6. Price-Quality Segmentation Profile of the U.S. Cola Market, 2008

In 2008 Cola Carbonated Beverage market had retail sales of $6,639 million. Using Hierarchical Cluster Analysis, the data did *not* support Hypothesis I for both 2008 and 2007, because Coca-Cola Classic Regular, the *market leader*, was a member of the *super-premium* segment, *not mid-price* (Datta, 2024f).

Similarly, the data did not support Hypothesis II for both 2008 and 2007 either, because Pepsi Regular, the *runner-up*, had a unit price that was *higher* than that of the *market leader*, Coca-Cola Classic Regular (*ibid*).

Because, as mentioned earlier, the Cola market in 2008 and 2007 was a *duopoly*, and this enabled *both* the market leader, Coca-Cola, and the runner-up, Pepsi, to charge *super-premium* prices.

7. The Role of Promotion

For 2008 the promotional sales of the Cola Carbonated Beverage Market averaged 70% of net retail sales.

In the *Discretionary Food* Group, the average promo scores for the remaining three markets are as follows (Datta, 2024f):

- Lager Beer—48%
- Non-Cola-Lemon-Lime Regular Carbonated Beverage—54%
- Potato Chip—54 %.

So, the question is: Why the promo score of Cola Beverage market is so high?

Now let us take Lager Beer. First, lager beer is much *more* expensive than Cola Beverage. Second, a typical lager beer has an alcoholic content of 5% (Datta, 2017). So, there is only so much beer one can drink every day.

Although Potato Chips are relatively inexpensive, there is a limit to how much one can consume them in a single day (2024f).

Now let us take the Cola Beverage. First, it does not cost much, and so it would not be inappropriate to call it the "People's Drink" (Datta, 2024f).

Some people drink soft drinks like *water* because they find them *tasty*. However, soft drinks are not only *not* as hydrating as water, but can also have *negative* health effects (*ibid*).

As we have reported earlier, *sugar*, *caffein*, and *carbonation* make soft drinks highly *addictive*. So, there is only one conclusion one can draw from all the evidence we have presented:

- The Cola industry is relying on *heavy* promotion because soft drinks are highly *addictive*.

C. The U.S. Non-Cola--Lemon-Lime Regular Carbonated Beverage Market

1. Introduction

In this group, there were *three* corporate players: Mountain Dew, the *market leader*, owned by PepsiCo; Dr. Pepper, the *runner-up*, owned by Keurig--Dr. Pepper Co; and Sprite Lemon-Lime, owned by the Coca Cola Co (Datta, 2024f).

2. Mountain Dew

The original formula for Mountain Dew was invented in the 1940s by Tennessee beverage bottlers Barney and Ally Hartman. They created Mountain Dew as a *mixer* for moonshine and other liquor (*ibid*).

In the 19th century, the name "Mountain Dew" was a slang term for whiskey, especially Highland Scotch. The Hartmans secured a trademark for the name in 1948 (*ibid*).

The main ingredient of Mountain Dew is concentrated *orange juice* (*ibid*).

The Pepsi-Cola Co. acquired the Mountain Dew brand and production rights in August 1964 (*ibid*).

3. Dr. Pepper

Dr. Pepper was created in the 1880s by pharmacist Charles Alderton in Waco, TX. Dr Pepper was first nationally marketed in the United States in 1904. It is now sold in countries around the entire world (*ibid*).

Dr Pepper is owned and sold by the Keurig--Dr. Pepper Co (*ibid*).

Although Dr Pepper is similar to a *cola*, the American Food and Drug Administration has ruled that “Dr Pepper is not a cola, nor a root beer, nor a fruit-flavored soft drink.” Rather, it is said to be in a category of its own, called "pepper soda” (Datta, 2024f).

4. Sprite Lemon-Lime

The *brand* Sprite was created in 1955 by T. C. "Bud" Evans, a Coca-Cola distributor in Houston. The Coca-Cola Co. acquired the rights to the name in 1960 (Datta, 2024f).

The lemon-lime *drink* known as Sprite today was developed in West Germany in 1959 as Fanta Klare Zitrone, and was introduced in the United States under the Sprite name in 1961 as a competitor to 7 Up (*ibid*).

5. Price-Quality Segmentation Profile of the U.S. Non-Cola--Lemon-Lime Carbonated Beverage Market. 2008

The Non-Cola--Lemon-Lime Regular market had retail sales of $5,415 million in 2008. Using Hierarchical Cluster analysis, the data did not support Hypothesis I because Mountain Dew, the *market leader*, was a member of the *premium* segment for both 2008 and 2007.

However, the data *did* support Hypothesis II, because, Dr. Pepper, the *runner-up*, had a unit price that was *lower* than that of the market leader, Mountain Dew for both 2008 and 2007.

6. The Role of Promotion

For 2008 the *promotional* sales of the Non-Cola--Lemon-Lime Regular market were 54% of net retail sales: a lot *lower* than 70% for the Cola market.

D. The U.S. Potato Chip Market

1. Introduction

The legend has it that Moon Lake House, an upscale hotel in Saratoga Springs, NY is the *birthplace* of potato chip (Burhans, 2017, p. 20; Datta, 2020d).

Chipping potatoes are *different* from potatoes for baking and salads (*ibid*, p. 4).

One chipper variety is *Snowden*. Ohio farmers grow this variety especially for *winter* storage, because fresh potatoes cannot be found from November to March. Large chip producers like Frito-Lay insist on a product that is *consistent* year-round. One problem with storage of potatoes like Snowden is *heat*. If the temperature is too low, starch in the potatoes turns to sugar, and that results in a brown chip. If the temperature is too high, that can also yield a brown chip (*ibid*, p. 6; Datta, 2020d).

However, Ohio farmers without irrigation facilities found it hard to meet the *consistency* level demanded by Frito-Lay. So, the company switched to growers in Michigan and North Dakota who had access to irrigation facilities (Burhans, pp. 6-7; Datta, 2020d).

Many potato growers complain that Frito-Lays and other large chip makers have imposed a standard for white unblemished potatoes that is both arbitrary and *unjustified*. They say that even though customers do not really care if some of the chips have minor blemishes, the large manufacturers use this as an *excuse* to drive the purchase price of potatoes *down* (*ibid*, p. 8; Datta, 2020d).

In 1895 William Tappenden of Cleveland, OH made a move from a “humble kitchen-cooked product to factory production,” by converting a *barn* at the rear of his house into one of the *first* potato chip factories (Burhans, pp. 23-24; Datta, 2020d).

In the 1920s and 1930s all potato chips were still being made using a *batch* process (*ibid*, p. 29; Datta, 2020d).

This was the time when J. D. Ferry Co. of Harrisburg, PA became successful in inventing a *continuous* cooker for potato chips. The cooker allowed uncooked potato slices introduced at one end that were carried downstream in hot oil, through a system of paddles to the other end: a process that took three to four minutes. So, it was no longer necessary to cook potato chips by the batch (Burhans, pp. 29-30; Datta, 2020d).

In 1934 the Dixie Wax Paper Co.--maker of the Dixie Cup—finally came up with a *truly* sealed bag, the Fresheen bag, using glassine. This innovation *revolutionized* the industry. It took potato chips off the counter, and made it possible to ship them to distances *more* than twenty miles from the factory (Burhans, p. 33; Datta, 2020d).

2. The Birth of Frito-Lay

During the Great Depression of 1929, Herman Lay lost his job as a salesman. He then became a distributor for an Atlanta-based snack producer called Barrett's who sold Gardner potato chips. When Barrett died his widow was faced with a failing business. So Lay raised enough cash to buy Barrett's three plants (Burhans, p. 40; Datta, 2020d).

This was the start of a *remarkable* strategy of "Buying up small:" an idea *few* in the industry had considered before (*ibid*, p. 42; Datta, 2020d).

Next, Lay set out on a *buying spree* that involved several small potato chip businesses that covered a wide-ranging area. He also built *new* plants in several states (*ibid*, p. 44; Datta, 2020d).

Elmer Doolin was the owner of an ice cream business in San Antonio, TX. Fascinated by a package of *corn chips* he had bought at a small restaurant, he bought the man's recipe, rights to his retail accounts and his production equipment (*ibid*, pp. 44-45; Datta, 2020d).

And that is how *Fritos* was born (*ibid*, pp. 44-45; Datta, 2020d).

The two companies *merged* in 1962 (*ibid*).

In 1965 Frito-Lay merged with PepsiCo (*ibid*, p. 60; Datta, 2020d).

3. Potato Chip and Television: A Symbiotic Relationship

People often like to eat *snacks* while watching TV. While Television depends upon advertising revenue, snack foods depend upon Television for promotion. In the early days of TV, the biggest beneficiary of the trend toward eating while watching TV was the *potato chip*. It was at this time that the industry *shifted* from flat-cut chip towards "rippled," "wavy," and "marcelled" chip. This was the time when Frito-Lay introduced *Ruffles*: a *thicker* and sturdier potato chip with *ridges* (Burhans, p. 47; Datta, 2020d).

4. Proctor & Gamble (P&G) Introduces Pringles

In 1967 P&G introduced Pringles, a *prefabricated* potato chip. P&G devised a tennis-ball *canister* where perfectly formed half-moon Pringles could be stacked together *unbroken* (Burhans, p. 57; Datta, 2020d).

The Kellogg Co. acquired Pringles from P&G in 2012 (Hsu, 2012; Datta, 2020d).

The two companies that made an unsuccessful bid to enter the potato chip market were Borden and Anheuser Busch (Burhans, pp. 74, 82; Datta, 2020d).

5. Frito-Lay's Powerful Distribution System

Frito-Lay set up a *unique* "store-door" distribution system that *bypasses* warehouses: a system that has become the *envy* of the industry. These route-men *enter* each store and check store shelves regularly, making sure the stocks are orderly, fresh, and full (Burhans, p. 61; Datta, 2020d).

But, *most* importantly, the *driving force* behind Frito-Lay's highly profitable operations is its "10,000-person sales force and its 99.5% service level" (Peters & Waterman, 1982; MacMillan, 1983).

6. Price-Quality Segmentation Profile of the U.S. Potato Chip Market 2008

For 2008 the net U.S. retail Potato Chip sales were $3.07 billion. Using Hierarchical Cluster analysis, we found that the results supported Hypothesis I; both the *market leader* Lay's Plain Potato Chip--and the *runner-up* Pringles Original Potato Chip--were members of the *mid-price* segment, and that the unit price of the market leader was *higher* than that of the runner-up for both 2008 and 2007.

For 2008 PepsiCo, the *market leader*, dominated this market with Lay's brand market share of 44.1%, and Ruffle brand's share of 12.9%. This was followed by P&G's Pringle brand--now owned by the Kellog Co--the *runner-up*, with a market share of 10.7% (Datta 2020d).

7. The Role of Promotion

For 2008 promotional sales of the U.S. Potato Chip market averaged 54% of net retail sales.

E. An Overview of the Food Group—Discretionary

The path that Adolphous Busch followed in introducing American Adjunct pale lager Budweiser in 1876 may be described as "The First-to-Market" strategy.

This new beer was so successful that it *changed* the face of American brewing for *all* time and did so almost *overnight.*

In 2008 *American Adjunct* pale lager accounted for 86% of U.S. lager sales.

Of the 10 best-selling beer brands in the world, *seven* are traditional American Adjunct pale lagers: and three are American brands.

2. Anheuser Busch a Perennial Market Leader in the Most Competitive Global Market in America

The U.S. Beer industry is a *global mega*-market. It had 2008 net retail sales of $9.5 billion.

The industry is quite *complex*. The *variety* it offers to customers is so immense that it is in a league of its *own*.

A glimpse of this variety is provided by the number of *brands*. In 2008 the U.S. *lager* segment had 122 brands followed by 79 in the *ale* segment.

Now let us look at the various ways the U.S. Beer market is segmented:

- *Process* of production: *Lager* vs. *Ale*
- *Presence* of Adjunct grains: (Bud Light, Budweiser, Corona)
- *Calories*-based classification: *Regular* (Budweiser) vs. *Light* (Bud Light)
- *Color* styles: *Pale* (Bud Light, Budweiser) vs. *Dark* (Negra Modelo's Munich Dunkel lager)
- *Major Lager* groups:
    - *Traditional* (Budweiser, Bud Light,)
    - "*Imports"* (Corona, Heineken)
    - *Craft* (Samuel Adams, Yuengling, Anchor Steam)
- *Drinkability*--Session Beer: It is a beer that by the end of the evening one looks *forward* to repeating the experience again.

2. The Coca-Cola Co: A Colossus in the Cola Market

Pharmacist John Pemberton who created Coca-Cola in 1886 deserves a lot of credit for inventing the cola drink which has now become by far the leading soft drink in America. This was the result of his following, like Anheuser Busch, the "First-to-Market" strategy.

The Cola Carbonated Beverage Market is a *duopoly* in which the Coca-Cola Co. had a 56% market share in 2008.

That has enabled Coca-Cola Co.—and the *runner-up* PepsiCo—to charge *super-premium* prices.

The important question is how the Coca-Cola Co. has achieved such resounding success?

We can cite several factors:

- The company has kept the *formula* for Coca-Cola as a closely guarded trade *secret*.
- The Coca-Cola Co. produces *syrup concentrate* which is then sold throughout the world to *bottlers* who hold *exclusive* territories created by the company's *franchise* system.
- The iconic Coca-Cola *contour* bottle has been celebrated in art, music and advertising as a representative of *mass culture*.
- When the Cola industry switched from sugar to *cheaper* high fructose corn syrup (HFCS), the industry generally *increased* the *size* of their cola bottles rather than significantly lowering the price of the drink.
- The United States has some of the *highes*t rates of soft drink consumption in the world. Some of the health risks associated with such high consumption of soda include: diabetes, weight gain, and cavities.
- Neuroscientists have concluded that the *sugar*, *caffeine,* and *carbonation* of soft drinks are designed to deliver intense and *addictive* experiences that leave you wanting more.
- For 2008 the promotional sales of the Cola market averaged 70% of net retail sales, by far the

highest in the *Discretionary Food Group*.

- The Cola industry is relying on *heavy* promotion because these soft drinks are highly *addictive*.

3. The Frito-Lay Co.

The secret of Frio-Lay's phenomenal success in the Potato Chip market are *two*-fold:

- Frito-Lay's *unique* "store-door" distribution system that has become the *envy* of the industry.
- But, *most* importantly, the *driving force* behind Frito-Lay's highly profitable operations is its 10,000-person sales force and its 99.5% service level.

Table 1. A Socio-economic Class Lifestyle Profile of America: 2008

Broad Income Group	Percentile	Socio-economic Class	Lifestyle Profile	Percentile	Income Threshold
The Upper Class	**Top 0.5%**	*The Super-Rich*	*"Masters of the Universe"*	**Top 0.01%**	$9,141,190
		The Very Rich	*"Conspicuous Consumption*	**Top 0.1-.01%**	$1,695,136
		The Rich	*"Conspicuous Consumtion*	**Top 0.5%-0.1%**	$558,726
The Middle Class	**40-99.5%**	The Upper Middle Class	"Cultured Affluence"	**80-99.5%**	$100,240
		The Traditional Middle Class	"From Keeping-up with the Joneses" to "Good Public Schools in Suburbia"	**40-80%**	$39,000
The Lower Class	**The Bottom 40%**	"The Near Poor"	"Just Making It"	**20-40%**	$20, 712
		"The Poor"	"Survival"	**Bottom 20%**	

Table 2. A Competitive Profile of 24 Consumer Markets

Name of Market	Market Leader	PQSegment	Corporate Parent
I. The Food Group--Discretionary			
Beer	Bud Light	*Mid-Price*	Anheuser Busch In-Bev
Cola Carbonated Beverage	Coca-Cola	*Super-Premium*	Coca-Cola Co.
Non-Cola Lemon-Lime Reg. Carbonated Beverage	Mountain Dew	*Premium*	PepsiCo
Potato Chip	Lay's	*Mid-Price*	PepsiCo
II. The Food Group—Non-Discretionary			
Coffee	Folgers	*Economy*	Procter & Gamble
Chicken Noodle Soup	Campbell	*Mid-Price*	Campbell Soup Co
Shredded-Grated Cheese	Kraft	*Mid-Price*	Kraft-Heinz Group
Refrigerated Orange Juice	Tropicana	*Mid-Price*	PepsiCo
III. Personal Grooming			
Shampoo	Pantene	*Mid-Price*	Procter & Gamble
Toothpaste	Crest	*Mid-Price*	Procter & Gamble
Men's Razor Blades	Gillette Mach 3	*Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Women's Razor Blades	Gillette Venus	*Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Men's Shaving Gel	Edge	*Mid-Price*	Edgewell Personal Care
IV. Personal Hygiene			
Toilet Paper	Charmin	*Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Disposable Diapers	Pampers	*Super-Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Stick/Solid Deodorant	Secret	*Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Sanitary Pads	Always UltThin with Wings	*Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Va Laundry and Dishwashing Detergents			
Heavy-Duty Liquid Laundry Detergent	Tide	*Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Automatic Dishwashing Detergent	Cascade	*Mid-Price*	Procter & Gamble
Hand Dishwashing Detergent	Palmolive	*Mid-Price*	Colgate Palmolive
Vb. Household Cleaning and Alkine AA Battery			
Paper Towels	Bounty	*Super-Premium*	Procter & Gamble
Facial Tissue	Kleenex	*Mid-Price*	Kimberly Clark Corp.
Household Liquid Non-Disinfectant Cleaner	Formula 409	*Mid-Price*	Clorox Corp.
Alkaline AA Battery	Energizer	*Mid-Price*	Energizer Holdings, Inc.

Acknowledgement

We are *immensely* grateful to A.C. Nielson Co. for their extraordinary generosity for the invaluable U.S. national retail sales data of these 24 U.S. consumer markets for 2008 and 2007, without which the entire long project would *not* have been possible.

References

Ansoff, H. I. & Stewart, J. M. (1967). Strategies for a technology-based business. *Harvard Business Review*, *45*(6), 71-83.

Barnett, N. L. (1969). Beyond market segmentation. *Harvard Business Review*. *47*(1), 152-166.

Burhans, D. (2017). *Crunch: A history of the great American potato chip*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Datta, Y. (1996). Market segmentation: An integrated framework. *Long Range Planning*, *29*(6), 797-811. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(97)82817-8

Ogle, M. (2006). *Ambitious Brew: The story of American beer*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Inc.

Datta, Y. (2010a). A critique of Porter's cost leadership and differentiation strategies. *Chinese Business Review*, *9*(4), 37-51.

Datta, Y. (2010b). Strategic group theory: A customer-oriented view. *Chinese Business Review*, *9*(7), 11-26, 36.

Datta, Y. (2011). Rising economic inequality and class divisions in America: A socio-economic class lifestyle profile. *Oxford Journal*, *11*(1), 1-25.

Datta, Y. (2012). The U.S. men's shaving cream market: A competitive profile. *Chinese Business Review*, *11*(1), 44-64. https://doi.org/10.17265/1537-1506/2012.01.003

Datta, Y. (2017). The U.S. Beer market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *3*(4), 541-579. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v3n4p541

Datta, Y. (2018a). The U.S. Shampoo Market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *4*(2), 180-207. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v4n2p180

Datta, Y. (2018b). The U.S. Shredded/Grated Cheese market: A competitive profile. *China-USA Business Review*, *17*(8), 385-401. https://doi.org/10.17265/1537-1514/2018.08.001

Datta, Y. (2018c). The U.S. Refrigerated Orange Juice market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *4*(4), 389-409. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v4n4p389

Datta, Y. (2019a). The U.S. Men's Razor-Blade market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *5*(3), 354-374. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v5n3p354

Datta, Y. (2019b). The U.S. Women's Razor-Blade market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *5*(4), 491-508. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v5n4p491

Datta, Y. (2020a). The U.S. Toothpaste market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *6*(1), 145-167. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v6n1p145

Datta, Y. (2020b). The U.S. Canned Soup market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *6*(2), 153-172. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v6n2p153

Datta, Y. (2020c). The U.S. Coffee Market: A competitive profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *6*(3), 138-171. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v6n3p138

Datta, Y. (2020d). The U.S. Potato Chip Market. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *6*(4), 86-107. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v6n4p86

Datta, Y. (2022). A Brief History of the American Middle Class. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *8*(3), 127-164. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v8n3p127

Datta, Y. (2023a). The U.S. Facial Tissue Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *9*(3), 92-105. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v9n3p92

Datta, Y. (2023b). The U.S. Toilet Paper Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *9*(3), 140-156. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v9n3p140

Datta, Y. (2023c). The U.S. Paper Towel Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *9*(4), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v9n4p1

Datta, Y. (2023d). The U.S. Disposable Diapers Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *9*(4), 99-114. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v9n4p99

Datta, Y. (2024a). The U.S. Sanitary Pads Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *10*(1), 20-39. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v10n1p20

Datta, Y. (2024b). The U.S. Automatic-Dishwasher Detergent and Hand-Dishwashing Detergent Markets: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *10*(1), 109-134. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v10n1p109

Datta, Y. (2024c). The U.S. Household Liquid Non-Disinfectant Cleaner Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *10*(3), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v10n3p1

Datta, Y. (2024d). The U.S. Heavy-Duty Laundry Detergent Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *10*(3), 32-49. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v10n3p32

Datta, Y. (2024e). The U.S. Deodorant Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *10*(4), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v10n4p1

Datta, Y. (2024f). The U.S. Carbonated Beverages Market: A Competitive Profile. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, *10*(4), 102-132. https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v10n4p102

Hsu, T. (2012). Kellogg's buys Procter & Gamble's Pringles chips for $2.7 billion. *Los Angeles Times*, Feb. 15. Retrieved from https://www.latimes.com/business/la-xpm-2012-feb-15-la-fi-mo-kellogg-pringles-sale-20120215-story.html#:~:text=instead.,nearly%20%242.7%20billion%20in%20cash

Ketchen, Jr., D. J., & Shook, C. L. (1996). The application of cluster analysis in strategic management research: An analysis and critique. *Strategic Management Journal*, *17*, 441-458. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199606)17:6%3C441::AID-SMJ819%3E3.0.CO;2-G

Knoedelseder, W. (2012). *Bitter Brew: The rise and fall of Anheuser-Busch and America's kings of Beer*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

MacMillan, I. C. (1983). Preemptive strategies. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *Fall*, 16-26. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb039016

Mosher, R. (2009). *Tasting Beer: An insider's guide to the world's greatest drink*. North Adams, MA.

Ogle, M. (2006). *Ambitious Brew: The story of American beer*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Inc.

Pendergrast, M. (1999). *Uncommon grounds: The history of coffee and how it transformed our world*. New York: Basic Books.

Peters, T. J., and Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.

Pollan M. (2006). *Omnivore's dilemma*. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. New York, N.Y.: Free Press.

Talley, J. (2017). *Session beers: Brewing for flavor and balance*. Boulder, Col.: Brewers Publications.

Notes

Note 1. Profit Impact of Market Strategies.

Note 2. For a discussion of the process of Hierarchical Cluster analysis and its application to an individual market, see Ketchen and Shook (1996), and Datta (2024f).

Note 3.

https://www.google.com/search?q=After+switching+to+cheaper+corn+syrup+did+the+Cola+industry+reduce+cola+price+or+increased+the+bottle+size+of+cola+drinks&rlz=1C1RXQR_enUS1087US1087&oq=After+switching+to+cheaper+corn+syrup+did+the+Cola+industry+reduce+cola+price+or+increased+the+bottle+size+of+cola+drinks&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUyBggAEEUYOdIBCzExMjU2MmowajE1qAIIsAIB8QVKDglPic1xQw&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8