

Retail Grocery Store Marketing Strategies and Obesity

An Integrative Review

Karen Glanz, PhD, MPH, Michael D.M. Bader, PhD, Shally Iyer, MPH

Context: In-store food marketing can influence food-purchasing behaviors and warrants increased attention given the dramatic rise in obesity. Descriptive and experimental studies of key marketing components have been conducted by consumer scientists, marketing researchers, and public health experts. This review synthesizes research and publications from industry and academic sources and provides direction for developing and evaluating promising interventions.

Evidence acquisition: Literature sources for the review were English-language articles published from 1995 to 2010, identified from multidisciplinary search indexes, backward searches of cited articles, review articles, industry reports, and online sources. Only articles that focused on physical grocery stores and food products were included. Data collection occurred in 2010 and 2011.

Evidence synthesis: Articles were classified in the categories of product, price, placement, and promotion and divided into controlled laboratory experiments, observation, and field experiments; 125 primary peer-reviewed articles met the inclusion criteria. Narrative synthesis methods were used. Key findings were synthesized by category of focus and study design. Evidence synthesis was completed in 2011.

Conclusions: Findings suggest several strategies for in-store marketing to promote healthful eating by increasing availability, affordability, prominence, and promotion of healthful foods and/or restricting or de-marketing unhealthy foods. Key results of research in controlled laboratory studies should be adapted and tested in real-world in-store settings. Industry methods for assessing consumer behavior, such as electronic sales data and individually linked sales information from loyalty card holders, can help public health researchers increase the scientific rigor of field studies.

(*Am J Prev Med* 2012;42(5):503–512) © 2012 American Journal of Preventive Medicine

Context

The prevalence of obesity has steadily increased for 2 decades, and addressing this problem is a national health priority.¹ Increasingly, public health experts have highlighted the importance of understanding how the environments in which people

live, work, and play affect their health, including obesity-related factors.² The role of marketing and advertising of unhealthy foods, especially to children, has also been highlighted.³ Retail grocery stores, the primary locations for food purchases, are receiving increased attention as an environment that may be ripe for public health interventions.⁴ Grocery stores are pivotally positioned between the public and the products they eat and are an opportune place to harness marketing power to prevent obesity.

Supermarkets are strategic and critical allies in the fight to prevent obesity.^{5–10} Grocery stores can provide critical opportunities to increase access to healthy foods, including fresh fruits, vegetables, and lean meats, potentially improving health and curtailing the rise in obesity. The health effects of increasing the presence of grocery stores in disadvantaged neighbor-

From the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics (Glanz), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; the Department of Sociology and Center on Health, Risk and Society (Bader), American University, Washington, DC; and the Community Health Program (Iyer), The San Francisco Foundation, San Francisco, California

Address correspondence to: Karen Glanz, PhD, MPH, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 801 Blockley Hall, 423 Guardian Drive, Philadelphia PA 19104. E-mail: kglanz@upenn.edu.

0749-3797/\$36.00

doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2012.01.013

hoods are not clear,^{5,6} although evaluations are under way. One recent study linked the proliferation of Walmart Supercenters to increases in obesity, in part because of the low cost of foods at these stores.⁷ A better understanding of how supermarkets create demand for healthy and less-healthy purchasing patterns needs to be part of the toolkit of health advocates and researchers.⁸

Much remains to be learned about food marketing at grocery stores, including labeling, packaging, pricing, and point-of-sale advertising practices that can help address the growing burden of obesity. To date, however, most of this research has not been familiar or accessible to public health professionals. Research and publications on marketing and consumer behavior and industry sources can provide valuable foundations for progress in understanding and harnessing health-promoting grocery store marketing strategies. The current study reviews research on the topic and provides direction for developing and evaluating possible interventions.

Evidence Acquisition

Scope and Conceptual Framework

The core references for this review were publications that focus on aspects of food marketing confronted by consumers in grocery stores, components of those strategies, and consumer responses to in-store marketing. This paper does not focus on food marketing conducted through broadcast media, online/Internet marketing, or outdoor advertising, as these issues have been reviewed and discussed elsewhere.^{3,9-12} The overarching conceptual framework used to organize the review is based on the key strategic elements of the marketing mix, or the 4 P's: product, price, place, and promotion.¹³

Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria

The literature sources for this review of multidisciplinary research on grocery store-based food marketing were obtained through a two-stage process. To be included, primary sources had to be (1) written in English; (2) published since 1995 (the 15-year window was designed to best capture the contemporary state of the science); (3) original empirical research; and (4) studies that contain marketing influences on food purchases or consumption and that focus on physical (i.e., not online) stores that sell groceries (or laboratory manipulations to mimic such environments).

In the first stage, a broad range of search terms (Appendix A, available online at www.ajpmonline.org) was used to identify English-language publications in research indexes from health, nutrition and social sciences (i.e., MEDLINE, AGRICOLA, CINAHL, ERIC, PsycINFO, JSTOR, EBSCO, and Google Scholar). Articles were screened for inclusion, and those selected were reviewed to identify pertinent papers. Forward and backward reference searches of citations were conducted until saturation of the relevant literature was achieved. For community intervention studies of in-store food marketing strategies pre-dating 2004, the findings of published review papers^{4,14} were summarized rather than re-analyzed in detail.

In total, 125 original research articles were included in the review. Primary research articles were supplemented with (1) review and commentary articles identified during the search process ($n=21$); a seminal book on consumer marketing in grocery stores¹⁵; and industry reports ($n=5$) and key online sources of relevant descriptive data that the authors received through participation in academic-industry conferences on the topic. Evidence acquisition occurred in 2010 and 2011.

Evidence Synthesis

Evidence synthesis was completed in 2011. Article abstractions included summaries of goals, methods, and key findings. Quantitative methods and meta-analysis were not feasible given the wide range of outcomes, measures, and research designs in the multiple disciplines represented in evidence sources. Narrative synthesis of the findings was used to extract and summarize findings from multiple studies across disciplines, by juxtaposing findings from multiple studies with common themes.¹⁶ Key findings were synthesized in the categories of product, price, placement, and promotion. Within categories, research was synthesized by main study design features: controlled experiments, observational, and community intervention studies. (Appendix B, available online at www.ajpmonline.org, provides a glossary of market research and retailing terms.)

Trends in Retail Grocery Food Sales

Although consumer food markets are changing rapidly, traditional full-service supermarkets continue to dominate retail food sales.¹⁷ Two thirds of grocery shoppers are women, and they are most likely to shop on Fridays and weekends.¹⁸ The recession of the past few years has increased consumers' cost-saving efforts; price increasingly drives the choice of stores and products, and the use of coupons and bargain shopping is on the rise.¹⁹

A few important trends in food shopping are noteworthy. Private label, or store brands, are taking an increasing share of consumer shopping dollars as the importance of national brands declines.^{17,19} Shoppers' stated priorities are quality, or taste, and price; although many say they are increasingly interested in healthy choices, their shopping behaviors do not always favor healthful products.¹⁹ Demand for locally grown food is increasing.^{17,19} Loyalty cards and slotting allowances remain important.¹⁹⁻²² Although cost consciousness has increased the proportion of planned purchases and 65% of shoppers use lists, shoppers report that choices are often influenced by end-of-aisle and merchandising displays, and other in-store promotions.²⁰

Findings

Findings are described here in categories aligned with the four “marketing mix” components: product, price, place, and promotion. Some studies are reported in more than one section. Within each section, findings are described first for controlled and laboratory studies and then for observational and community intervention studies.

Products. Grocery retailers decide what products to stock, how many to stock, and how much variety (assortment) to offer, or *product assortment*, the focus of 30 papers. Consumers value variety, which generates traffic to stores²³; however, too much choice can be overwhelming and consumers prefer fewer options, provided that their preferred brand or product is available.^{24,25} Consumer perceptions of how much variety exists is not completely correlated with actual variety and is conditioned by consumer goals (e.g., to find a specific product versus to choose among a variety); the traits on which they evaluate products; whether they are choosing a hedonic versus utilitarian good; and whether they rely on external aids such as shopping lists to make their decision.^{26–31} The assortment of products is related to its placement in the store, discussed later under Placement.

The *design of products and packaging* was the focus of ten papers. Unusual colors or shapes can be used by marketers to increase interest in products and is especially pervasive among “fun foods” marketed to children that are largely unwholesome.^{32,33} Package design, including where text and images are placed, influences product recall and can influence purchases,³⁴ although the influence of design differs by the type of display consumer segments seek (convenience, information, or images).³⁵ Package sizes have a relatively strong influence on consumption; *larger* packages might increase per-use consumption but *smaller* packages might not improve self-regulation and may actually increase total consumption.^{36–38}

Finally, *private labels* (store brands) were the focus of six studies. Quality private-label brands positioned to compete with top-selling national-level brands lead to profitability of both retailer and leading national brands at the expense of second-tier brands,^{39–41} particularly by attracting price-conscious consumers to the store brand from second-tier brands.⁴² Retailers value private-label brands because they increase leverage in negotiations with manufacturers and foster customer loyalty to retailers.^{41,43} From a health standpoint, private-label brands provide an opportunity to create food products that are lower in calories, fat, and added sugars.

Several observational studies in community settings address the association of product availability and food purchasing, eating patterns, and weight. Although there

is substantial research examining the association between proximity to different types of food stores and healthier diets and less obesity,^{44–46} fewer studies examine associations of diet and health with food availability *within* stores. Some early studies found that measures of selected types of healthy food product availability in stores were associated with individual dietary practices at the community and ZIP-code levels.⁴⁷ Follow-up research, however, suggested that *changes* in food product availability were not consistently associated with changes in dietary patterns.^{48,49}

Recent studies of availability of food products in stores examined correlates of both healthier and less-healthy products. Rose⁵⁰ and others found that cumulative shelf-space availability of energy-dense snack foods was positively, albeit modestly, associated with BMI of neighborhood residents; however, fruit and vegetable shelf-space was not significantly related to BMI. Franco⁵¹ and others found that less availability of healthy foods was associated with poorer dietary patterns but that associations were inconsistent for high-quality eating patterns. These observations suggest that health interventions need to alter the *presence of less-healthy foods* in stores, rather than attempting only to increase access to healthier options.

Field studies^{4,14} provide some evidence that increased availability and variety may increase sales of targeted types of foods. Several recent intervention projects in small stores (usually corner stores) have aimed to increase the availability of healthy food (e.g., fruits and vegetables and reduced-fat snack foods) in neighborhoods that are mainly low-income and ethnic minority.^{52–56} Some reports^{52–55,57} conclude that the corner store projects significantly improved healthy food availability; sales of healthier foods; and shoppers’ knowledge, purchasing, and consumption. Three studies that examined change in BMI before and after the interventions found no impact on weight.⁵⁷ The conclusions of these evaluations should be interpreted with caution given the design limitations (pre–post test designs that rely on self-reports) and potential for social desirability bias in respondent reports of change.

Price. Retailers determine the appropriate price at which to sell their products. The *elasticity* of products, or the unit increase in sales resulting from manipulating a factor (e.g., price, shelf-facings, point-of-purchase information), differs across types of products, and was the topic of six articles. Andreyeva et al.⁵⁸ review price elasticity across different categories of food, and public health experts agree that price manipulation is an important tool for promoting healthy diets, although who should bear responsibility for the costs of price changes is debated.^{59,60}

Studies of category-level elasticities emphasize the importance of consumer demographics on price sensitivity and find that disadvantaged groups and large families increase price elasticity, whereas store volume and geographically isolated stores lead to lower elasticity.^{61,62} Among in-store factors, within-category characteristics such as lead-brand market share increases whereas brand price and product bulk decrease category-level price elasticity more than promotion-related factors.⁶³

Demographic influences on price elasticity might result from different *price search* practices among consumers. Consumers generally can be segmented according to price-seeking behavior.⁶⁴ Specifically, shoppers with large baskets tend to shop at stores with an “Every Day Low Pricing” format while small-basket shoppers (who tend to be older, lower-income, and have smaller families) prefer “Hi-Lo” format stores,⁶⁵ and shoppers with high opportunity costs shop more regularly.⁶⁶

Price promotion strategies and methods used by grocery retailers are the topic of seven controlled studies. One⁶⁷ focuses on the extent to which consumers take advantage of featured advertising by retailers and finds that 39% of items in consumer baskets were promoted by retailers, with higher levels among poorer residents and those who read weekly circulars. Six studies of in-store coupons found that delivery of in-store coupons raises a consumer’s positive affect, which leads to more purchases overall and more unplanned purchases related to the promoted product.⁶⁸ In-store coupons can also increase retailer and manufacturer profits through price discrimination because of incomplete redemption.⁶⁹ Cross-promotion of products through a variety of methods can help increase traffic to a store and increase traffic to untraveled areas in stores⁷⁰; however, the cross-promotion must be designed carefully because characteristics of the products and categories being promoted may influence consumer behavior.^{71,72}

The use of price promotions can also lower the *price image* of stores and increase perceived value,^{73,74} although the price image can also be cultivated through other means including stores’ external architecture and service quality.⁷⁴⁻⁷⁶ The *periodicity* of price promotions also deserves consideration. Pricing timelines vary,⁷⁷ and the duration of coupons can influence profitability.^{78,79} Stockpiling (i.e., purchasing more than is immediately needed) due to price reductions can increase the convenience of products and lead to greater consumption.⁸⁰

In community research, pricing strategies have included price reductions and coupons. These strategies have been well received, but to date there is little evidence of their effectiveness.⁴ A study in New Zealand randomized shoppers to receive price discounts, tailored nutrition education, both, or a control condition and mea-

sured outcomes using personal scannable cards.⁸¹ There was no significant overall impact of either price discounts or education, although participants receiving discounts bought more of a subset of designated healthier foods after 6 months.^{81,82} The challenge of financing and sustaining store-based price reductions in field research may limit testing of these strategies in real-world settings.

Placement. A growing movement in grocery retailing is the coordination between manufacturers and retailers through *category management*. This streamlining of distribution provides retailers benefits over product management, but the approach tends to ignore potential consumer benefits such as identifying new products or effectively managing stocking of particular brands.^{83,84} Academic approaches to the topic, however, reveal a high level of shelf-space elasticity⁸⁵ and that differences in assortment breadth and depth are less influential on retail sales of staples than of fill-in, niche, or variety-enhancing products.⁸⁶

A focus on the *in-store location* of products is gaining growing attention among retailers and researchers under the rubric of “aisle management.”⁸⁷ This research shows that the proximity of categories to one another can influence cross-category purchases, as both facing aisles and end-of-aisle displays can increase purchases on a scale comparable to other marketing mix strategies,^{88,89} although these location effects do not affect products symmetrically.⁸⁸ Physical location can facilitate comparisons on different attributes. For example,⁹⁰ Desai and Ratneshwar²⁷ find that the positioning of low-fat variants of junk food influence perceptions of those foods. When such foods are in a health-food section, they are perceived as better tasting and less healthy than when they are positioned with junk food of the same category.^{27,91} In addition, if consumers purchase products in “virtue” categories early in a shopping trip, they increase purchasing of “vice” products later in the trip,⁹² although this may vary by economic and demographic characteristics of consumers.⁹³

In community research, placement strategies may deal with altering the in-store location of food products (e.g., at the end of aisles, on shelves, at eye level, or grouping/lack of grouping of foods). No published evaluations of these strategies were identified in the literature search. One report of an innovation in placement is the introduction of youth-designed “healthy checkout aisles” for a Wal-Mart store, first reported as part of the California Endowment’s Healthy Eating, Active Communities (HEAC) Program.⁹⁴ A midpoint review of HEAC indicates that this strategy “contributed to a healthier food environment,”⁹⁴ but no impact data for this specific strategy have been reported.

Promotion. The final element of the marketing mix is promotion, the topic of 24 articles, many of which overlapped with those in the Product and Placement categories. A number of methods are available for delivering promotions to consumers, including trade deals (discounted sales to retailer by manufacturers; this overlaps with “price” strategies), displays, featured advertising, and point-of-purchase information; general findings of research on promotion are reviewed in Blattberg et al.⁹⁵ Consumer differences influence the impact of the *delivery method* on sales as consumers vary in their latent proneness to the type of promotion (display, rebate, coupon, and sale). They are also influenced by the type of shopping trip, with unplanned purchases on products being more prevalent on major shopping trips, when stores are selected for low prices or attractive promotions, and when the unplanned purchase of a promoted item reduces the number of stops on a trip.^{96–98} The effects of promotions on individual products vary by the characteristics of the product, especially when the nature of the promotion leads consumers to directly compare similar products.⁹⁰

Eight articles focused specifically on *health messages*. Consumer research conducted for Europe’s front-of-package nutrition labeling program shows that consumers find nutrition labeling programs helpful, particularly when the information is presented succinctly and among obese or older consumers.^{99,100} Health is seen as a beneficial marketing strategy as nutrition claims lead to higher product evaluation and lower perceived health risk, even in the presence of contrary information.¹⁰¹ In addition, labeling products as “low fat” can actually increase consumption, though the impact may vary between normal-weight and obese people.¹⁰² These studies did not jointly assess purchasing with food consumption outcomes.

Promotions targeting children highlight a number of important issues in regard to the influence of in-store environments and childhood obesity. Children also influence purchases of routine household items not exclusively intended for children.^{103,104} While packaging is not included in industry self-regulation of marketing, promotions targeting children remain pervasive.¹⁰⁵ Package designs and colors provide semiotic cues about whether the product is “fun” or “healthy and boring.”^{106,107} Character licensing is a form of promotion targeting children. A recent study by Harris and colleagues¹⁰⁸ finds that five categories of food make up two thirds of the promotions targeted at children (cereals, fruit snacks, meal products, frozen dessert, and candy), and only 10% of products using child-oriented cross-promotions met IOM nutrition standards.

Three studies examined the promotional *relationships between retailers and manufacturers*.¹⁰⁹ The power of

grocery retailers relative to manufacturers is increasing, in part through private-label programs and in part through greater assertion of control in the promotion and delivery of products to consumers,¹¹⁰ and in distribution methods such as slotting fees.¹¹¹

In community-based research on promotion, a recent systematic audit of cereal placement and in-store marketing found that the least-healthy cereals were most marketed to children.¹¹² The most-studied promotion interventions in food stores involve point-of purchase (POP) nutrition information, signage, and posters. Most studies of these strategies in supermarkets have found POP strategies to be ineffective, except in a few cases where sales of specific targeted or “recommended” foods were increased after interventions.^{4,14} Health communications to increase demand have been found to contribute to success in corner store interventions.^{52–55} One cluster-randomized study of promotional public service announcements and audiotapes in stores found increased fruit and vegetable intake in both treatment and control groups, with somewhat greater increases in treatment-group shoppers.¹¹³

There are no published community studies of other in-store promotional interventions including signage, banners, increased advertising, samples, and taste-testing. However, industry reports describe shoppers’ profiles, priorities, and interests related to healthier food shopping. A 2010 national survey of a representative sample of shoppers found that 66% of shoppers are receptive to programs or services to help them make more-healthy food choices in shopping. They say they are most interested in coupons with price reductions for healthy foods, reward programs for purchasing healthier products, and promotion strategies including shelf labels identifying healthy products, product sampling and tasting, and healthy recipes.¹¹⁴ As far as in-store promotional appeals are concerned, shoppers most often notice end-of-aisle displays, merchandising displays, department signage, and shelf strips and shelf blades; they describe these channels plus product information on shelves as most influential on their purchase decisions.²⁰

Discussion

This review of scientific literature and industry reports on in-store marketing related to healthy food choice and obesity yields several lessons. Key findings, promising strategies, and research needs are summarized in Table 1. One important finding is that, to date, there is limited evidence that increasing access to healthy food products in stores increases healthful eating. Also, in large grocery store environments, point-of-purchase

Table 1. Key findings, promising strategies, and research needs

	Key findings	Promising strategies	Research needs
Products	Access to healthy foods may increase healthful eating.	Ensure availability of healthful products.	Rigorous evaluation designs, quality measures of foods and diet
	Less access to unhealthy foods may promote health.	Reduce/restrict/replace unhealthy foods.	Experimental research to supplement cross-sectional research
	Product packaging (size) and images affect purchase and consumption.	Provide small package sizes with prompts for self-regulation.	In-store research to test small packages and images on healthy items
Price	Price-change effects vary for customer subgroups.	Reduce prices for healthier items within categories (e.g., fruits, vegetables).	Evaluation of impact on varied income groups
	Coupons and cross-promotion increase product liking and purchase.	Use price reductions to increase acceptability of unfamiliar healthier foods.	Test effects and sustainability; qualitative research useful
Placement	In-store location matters; putting promoted products in prominent and “early trip” locations.	Place lower-calorie and healthier foods in visible, accessible locations.	Evaluate the use of placement manipulations in stores within and across products
	Healthy checkout aisles can be helpful for reducing unhealthy impulse purchases.	Place multiple healthy checkout aisles in stores to shift the healthy/unhealthy balance.	Rigorous impact evaluation and reliable/valid measures of checkout aisle offerings
Promotion	Most promotions of child-targeted foods are for sugary foods.	Increase promotion of nutrient-dense child-oriented foods.	Demonstration projects with health-committed cereal manufacturers
		Decrease promotion of sugary foods.	
	Shelf labels, samples and taste testing, and end-of-aisle displays are most noticed by customers.	Highlight healthy options by displays, labels, and taste-testing/samples.	Systematic manipulation of healthier options within categories in experiments

nutrition information promotions have not been very successful.

Another finding is that the “4 P’s” are not mutually exclusive but typically occur in combinations such as product plus placement, or price plus promotion. Focusing on a moderate number of products in a category may direct consumers toward healthier choices as alternatives within a category they already plan to buy. Price reductions and coupons can be effective for getting shoppers to try a different brand or type of a product, although they may not be sustainable to effect long-term change. Price manipulation is more likely to be effective for economically disadvantaged consumers.

With respect to placement and promotion, the amount of shelf-space, and prominence of location, such as at the end of an aisle, are influential. Placing healthier foods near their less-healthy counterparts may successfully promote them. Interventions may have greater impact if they are focused specifically on altering the placement and promotion of *less-healthy* foods, rather than merely on increasing access to

healthier options. End-of-aisle displays, merchandising displays, department signage, and shelf strips and shelf blades influence purchase decisions. More field experiment research is needed on placement and promotion strategies, building on laboratory studies and the lessons from previous research.

There are important limitations to marketing and consumer behavior research. With few exceptions, marketing researchers are interested in purchases rather than food intake. Second, much of the research is based on experiments in laboratory settings, often using university student subjects, or a few stores. Thus, the findings may not generalize to the wider population. With the exception of the corner store studies¹⁰⁸⁻¹¹³ that aim to increase healthy product availability, low-income and racially diverse communities have been omitted from much of the research on in-store health promotion. Research is needed on innovative targeted marketing techniques to improve the image, appeal, and affordability of nutritious products that could be substituted for unhealthy food products in these audiences.^{15,16}

Accurate measurement of in-store marketing environments is essential in assessing their effects on consumer behavior. Although the Nutrition Environment Measures Survey for stores tool assesses the availability of products and prices of key healthful foods compared to their less-healthy counterparts,¹¹⁵ no tools comprehensively address the additional components of the marketing mix in stores—placement and promotion. Elements of tools that assess aspects of grocery marketing environments in the U.S. and England are a useful foundation for these assessments.^{116,117} Measures need to be stable over time and sensitive to change in store environments.^{101–103}

Research on pricing and fiscal policies provides important insights that supplement in-store marketing research. Lower prices for vegetables, fruits, and dairy products have been found to predict lower gains in BMI among children,^{118,119} as well as intake of these products¹²⁰; but price variation for fast food and soft drinks did not predict consumption of these foods.¹²⁰ Analyses of the impact of taxes and subsidies have yielded mixed conclusions. One review¹²¹ concluded that small taxes or subsidies are not likely to significantly affect BMI or obesity prevalence. Another assessment¹²² found that taxes and subsidies generally influenced consumption and body weight in the desired direction, with larger taxes effecting greater change.¹²²

Increasingly, industry methods are being used in public health research to determine consumer behavior and shopping patterns. Electronic supermarket sales data, inventory data and loyalty card output, which are not typical public health research tools, can be used to evaluate the impact of food marketing for diverse populations. There is a need to build an evidence base for how to sell more-nutritious foods, and fewer low-nutrient, high-calorie food/beverage products, to children and families in a profitable or cost-neutral way. This can be best accomplished by encouraging retailers, designers, and public health researchers to come together to design and evaluate promising health-promoting marketing strategies.

This review was supported by the Healthy Eating Research Program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The authors thank the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Health and Society Scholars Program at the University of Pennsylvania (MDMB), and the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics (KG, MDMB, SI) for supporting this work.

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

References

1. Flegal KM, Carroll MD, Ogden CL, Curtin LR. Prevalence and trends in obesity among U.S. adults, 1999–2008. *JAMA* 2010;303(3):235–41.
2. Story M, Kaphingst KM, Robinson-O'Brien R, Glanz K. Creating healthy food and eating environments: policy and environmental approaches. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2008;29:253–72.
3. McGinnis M, Goodman JA, Kraak VI. Food marketing to children and youth: threat or opportunity? Washington DC: IOM, Food and Nutrition Board, 2006.
4. Glanz K, Yaroch AL. Strategies for increasing fruit and vegetable intake in grocery stores and communities: policy, pricing, and environmental change. *Prev Med* 2004;39(S2):S75–S80.
5. Cummins S, Petticrew M, Sparks L, Findlay A. Large scale food retail interventions and diet. *BMJ* 2005;330(7493):683–4.
6. The public health effects of food deserts: workshop summary. Washington DC: IOM, Food and Nutrition Board, 2009.
7. Courtemanche C, Carden A. Supersizing supercenters? The impact of Walmart Supercenters on body mass index and obesity. *J Urban Econ* 2011;69(2):165–81.
8. Bitler M, Haider SJ. An economic view of food deserts in the U.S. *J Pol Anal Manage* 2011;30(1):153–76.
9. Grier SA, Kumanyika S. Targeted marketing and public health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2010;31:349–69.
10. Grier SA, Kumanyika SK. The context for choice: health implications of targeted food and beverage marketing to African Americans. *Am J Public Health* 2008;98(9):1616–29.
11. Yancey AK, Cole BL, Brown R, et al. A cross-sectional prevalence study of ethnically targeted and general audience outdoor obesity-related advertising. *Milbank Q* 2009;87(1):155–84.
12. Powell LM, Szczypka G, Chaloupka FJ. Trends in exposure to television food advertisements among children and adolescents in the U.S. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2010;164(9):794–802.
13. Kotler P, Armstrong G. Principles of marketing. 13th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 2010.
14. Seymour JD, Yaroch AL, Serdula M, Blanck HM, Khan LK. Impact of nutrition environmental interventions on point-of-purchase behavior in adults: a review. *Prev Med* 2004;39(S2):S108–S136.
15. Kahn BE, McAlister L. Grocery revolution: the new focus on the consumer. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997.
16. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, et al. Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. A Product from the ESRC Methods Programme. Lancaster, UK: Lancaster University, 2006.
17. U.S. Department of Agriculture. The dynamics of change in the U.S. food marketing environment. In: Agriculture handbook 728-3. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, 2008.
18. Goodman J. Grocery shopping: who, where and when. Alexandria VA: The Time Use Institute, 2008.
19. Food Marketing Institute. U.S. grocery shopper trends 2009. Arlington VA: Food Marketing Institute, 2009.
20. Miller Zell. The elements report: Series 3 of Gone in 2.3 Seconds: capturing shoppers with effective in-store triggers. Atlanta GA: Miller Zell, 2009.
21. Bloom PN, Gundlach GT, Cannon JP. Slotting allowances and fees: schools of thought and the views of practicing managers. *J Market* 2000;64(2):92–108.
22. Cortinas M, Elorz M, Mugica JM. The use of loyalty-cards databases: differences in regular price and discount sensitivity in the brand choice decision between card and non-card holders. *J Retail Cons Serv* 2008;15(1):52–62.
23. Briesch RA, Chintagunta PK, Fox EJ. How does assortment affect grocery store choice. *J Market Res* 2009;46(2):176–89.
24. Iyengar SS, Lepper MR. When choice is demotivating: can one desire too much of a good thing? *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2000;79(6):995–1006.

25. Broniarczyk SM, Hoyer WD, McAlister L. Consumers' perceptions of the assortment offered in a grocery category: the impact of item reduction. *J Market Res* 1998;35(2):166-76.
26. Hoch SJ, Bradlow ET, Wansink B. The variety of an assortment. *Market Sci* 1999;18(4):527-46.
27. Desai K, Ratneshwar S. Consumer perceptions of product variants positioned on atypical attributes. *J Acad Market Sci* 2003;31(1):22-35.
28. Morales A, Kahn BE, McAlister L, Broniarczyk SM. Perceptions of assortment variety: the effects of congruency between consumers' internal and retailers' external organization. *J Retailing* 2005; 81(2):159-69.
29. Dhar R, Wertenbroch K. Consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian goods. *J Market Res* 2000;37(1):60-71.
30. Chandon P, Hutchinson JW, Bradlow ET, Young SH. Does in-store marketing work? Effects of the number and position of shelf facings on brand attention and evaluation at the point of purchase. *J Market* 2009;73(6):1-17.
31. Wanke M, Lehmann G, Bless H. The in and out of canned soup: brand management by influencing the categorization of brand exemplars—an inclusion/exclusion approach. 1997:85-6.
32. Miller EG, Kahn BE. Shades of meaning: the effect of color and flavor names on consumer choice. *J Cons Res* 2005;32(1):86-92.
33. Elliott C. Marketing fun foods: a profile and analysis of supermarket food messages targeted at children. *Can Publ Pol/Anal Polit* 2008;34(2):259-73.
34. Rettie R, Brewer C. The verbal and visual components of package design. *J Product Brand Manage* 2000;9(1):56-70.
35. Silayoi P, Speece M. The importance of packaging attributes: a conjoint analysis approach. *Eur J Market* 2007;41(11/12):1495-517.
36. Coelho do Vale R, Pieters R, Zeelenberg M. Flying under the radar: perverse package size effects on consumption self-regulation. *J Cons Res* 2008;35(3):380-90.
37. Wansink B. Can package size accelerate usage volume? *J Market* 1996;60(3):1-14.
38. Wansink B. Environmental factors that increase the food intake and consumption volume of unknowing consumers. *Annu Rev Nutr* 2004;24(1):455-79.
39. Pauwels K, Srinivasan S. Who benefits from store brand entry? *Market Sci* 2004;23(3):364-90.
40. Raju JS, Sethuraman R, Dhar SK. The introduction and performance of store brands. *Manage Sci* 1995;41(6):957-78.
41. Morton FS, Zettelmeyer F. The strategic positioning of store brands in retailer-manufacturer negotiations. *Rev Ind Organ* 2004;24(2): 161-94.
42. Corstjens M, Lal R. Building store loyalty through store brands. *J Market Res* 2000;37(3):281-91.
43. Hyman MR, Kopf DA, Lee D. Review of literature—future research suggestions: private label brands: benefits, success factors and future research. *J Brand Manage* 2009;17(5):368-89.
44. Black JL, Macinko J. Neighborhoods and obesity. *Nutr Rev* 2008; 66(1):2-20.
45. Larson NI, Story MT, Nelson MC. Neighborhood environments: disparities in access to healthy foods in the U.S. *Am J Prev Med* 2009;36(1):74-81.
46. Larson N, Story M. A review of environmental influences on food choices. *Ann Behav Med* 2009;38(S1):S56-S73.
47. Cheadle A, Psaty BM, Curry S, et al. Community-level comparisons between the grocery store environment and individual dietary practices. *Prev Med* 1991;20(2):250-61.
48. Cheadle A, Psaty BM, Curry S, et al. Can measures of the grocery store environment be used to track community-level dietary changes? *Prev Med* 1993;22(3):361-72.
49. Cheadle A, Psaty BM, Diehr P, et al. Evaluating community-based nutrition programs: comparing grocery store and individual-level survey measures of program impact. *Prev Med* 1995;24(1):71-9.
50. Rose D, Hutchinson PL, Bodor JN, et al. Neighborhood food environments and body mass index: the importance of in-store contents. *Am J Prev Med* 2009;37(3):214-9.
51. Franco M, Diez-Roux AV, Nettleton JA, et al. Availability of healthy foods and dietary patterns: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009;89(3):897-904.
52. Gittelsohn J, Dyckman W, Tan ML, et al. Development and implementation of a food store-based intervention to improve diet in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. *Health Promot Pract* 2006; 7(4):396-405.
53. Gittelsohn J, Dyckman W, Frick KD, et al. A pilot food store intervention in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. *Pac Health Dialog* 2007;14(2):43-53.
54. Gittelsohn J, Vijayadeva V, Davison N, et al. A food store intervention trial improves caregiver psychosocial factors and children's dietary intake in Hawaii. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2010;18(S1):S84-S90.
55. Ho LS, Gittelsohn J, Rimal R, et al. An integrated multi-institutional diabetes prevention program improves knowledge and healthy food acquisition in northwestern Ontario First Nations. *Health Educ Behav* 2008;35(4):561-73.
56. Bodor JN, Rice JC, Farley TA, Swalm CM, Rose D. The association between obesity and urban food environments. *J Urban Health* 2010;87(5):771-81.
57. Healthy corner stores: the state of the movement. Oakland CA: Public Health Law and Policy, 2009.
58. Andreyeva T, Long MW, Brownell KD. The impact of food prices on consumption: a systematic review of research on the price elasticity of demand for food. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100(2):216-22.
59. Hawkes C. Dietary implications of supermarket development: a global perspective. *Dev Policy Rev* 2008;26(6):657-92.
60. Waterlander WE, Steenhuis IHM, de Vet E, Schuit AJ, Seidell JC. Expert views on most suitable monetary incentives on food to stimulate healthy eating. *Eur J Public Health* 2010;20(3):325-31.
61. Hoch SJ, Kim B-D, Montgomery AL, Rossi PE. Determinants of store-level price elasticity. *J Market Res* 1995;32(1):17-29.
62. Montgomery AL. Creating micro-marketing pricing strategies using supermarket scanner data. *Market Sci* 1997;16(4):315-37.
63. Walters RG, Bommer W. Measuring the impact of product and promotion-related factors on product category price elasticities. *J Bus Res* 1996;36(3):203-16.
64. Berne C, Mugica JM, Pedraja M, Rivera P. The use of consumer's price information search behaviour for pricing differentiation in retailing. *Int Rev Retail Distrib Cons Res* 1999;9(2):127-46.
65. Bell DR, Lattin JM. Shopping behavior and consumer preference for store price format: why "large basket" shoppers prefer EDLP. *Market Sci* 1998;17(1):66-88.
66. Kim B-D, Park K. Studying patterns of consumer's grocery shopping trip. *J Retailing* 1997;73(4):501-17.
67. Walters R, Jamil M. Measuring cross-category specials purchasing: theory, empirical results, and implications. *J Market-Focused Manage* 2002;5(1):25-42. www.ingentaconnect.com/content/klu/jmfm/2002/00000005/00000001/00382013.
68. Heilman CM, Nakamoto K, Rao AG. Pleasant surprises: consumer response to unexpected in-store coupons. *J Market Res* 2002; 39(2):242-52.
69. Dhar SK, Hoch SJ. Price discrimination using in-store merchandising. *J Market* 1996;60(1):17-30.
70. Drèze X, Hoch SJ. Exploiting the installed base using cross-merchandising and category destination programs. *Int J Res Marketing* 1998;15(5):459-71.
71. Zhang ZJ, Krishna A, Dhar SK. The optimal choice of promotional vehicles: front-loaded or rear-loaded incentives? *Manage Sci* 2000;46(3):348-62.
72. Krishnan TV, Rao RC. Double couponing and retail pricing in a couponed product category. *J Market Res* 1995;32(4):419-32.

73. Desai KK, Talukdar D. Relationship between product groups' price perceptions, shopper's basket size, and grocery store's overall store price image. *Psychol Marketing* 2003;20(10):903–33.
74. Sirohi N, McLaughlin EW, Wittink DR. A model of consumer perceptions and store loyalty intentions for a supermarket retailer. *J Retailing* 1998;74(2):223–45.
75. Huddleston P, Whipple J, Mattick RN, Lee SJ. Customer satisfaction in food retailing: comparing specialty and conventional grocery stores. *Int J Retail Distribution Manage* 2009;37(1):63–80.
76. Zielke S, Toporowski W. Does architecture influence the price image and intention to shop in a retail store? In: *European retail research*. Wiesbaden: Gabler; 2009.
77. Bronnenberg BJ, Mela CF, Boulding W. The periodicity of pricing. *J Market Res* 2006;43(3):477–93.
78. Krishna A, Zhang ZJ. Short- or long-duration coupons: the effect of the expiration date on the profitability of coupon promotions. *Manage Sci* 1999;45(8):1041–56.
79. Wansink B, Kent RJ, Hoch SJ. An anchoring and adjustment model of purchase quantity decisions. *J Market Res* 1998;35(1):71–81.
80. Chandon P, Wansink B. When are stockpiled products consumed faster? A convenience? salience framework of postpurchase consumption incidence and quantity. *J Market Res* 2002;39(3):321–35.
81. Ni Mhurchu C, Blakely T, Jiang Y, Eyles HC, Rodgers A. Effects of price discounts and tailored nutrition education on supermarket purchases: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2010;91(3):736–47.
82. Blakely T, Ni Mhurchu C, Jiang Y, et al. Do effects of price discounts and nutrition education on food purchases vary by ethnicity, income and education? Results from a randomised, controlled trial. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;65(10):902–8.
83. Larson R. Making category management more practical. *J Food Distribution Res* 2005;36(1):101–5.
84. Holweg C, Schnedlitz P, Teller C. The drivers of consumer value in the ECR category management model. *Int Rev Retail Distribution Consumer Res* 2009;19(3):199–218.
85. Desmet P, Renaudin V. Estimation of product category sales responsiveness to allocated shelf space. *Int J Res Marketing* 1998;15(5):443–57.
86. Dhar SK, Hoch SJ, Kumar N. Effective category management depends on the role of the category [small star, filled]. *J Retailing* 2001;77(2):165–84.
87. Larson R. Core principles for supermarket aisle management. *J Food Distribution Res* 2006;37(01):100–3.
88. Bezawada R, Balachander S, Kannan PK, Shankar V. Cross-category effects of aisle and display placements: a spatial modeling approach and insights. *J Market* 2009;73(3):99–117.
89. Inman JJ, Winer RS, Ferraro R. The interplay among category characteristics, customer characteristics, and customer activities on in-store decision making. *J Market* 2009;73(5):19–29.
90. Lemon KN, Nowlis SM. Developing synergies between promotions and brands in different price-quality tiers. *J Market Res* 2002;39(2):171–85.
91. Kahn BE, Wansink B. The influence of assortment structure on perceived variety and consumption quantities. *J Cons Res* 2004;30(4):519–33.
92. Hui Sam K, Bradlow Eric T, Fader Peter S. Testing behavioral hypotheses using an integrated model of grocery store shopping path and purchase behavior. *J Cons Res* 2009;36(3):478–93.
93. Campo K, Gijsbrechts E, Goossens T, Verhetsel A. The impact of location factors on the attractiveness and optimal space shares of product categories. *Int J Res Marketing* 2000;17(4):255–79.
94. Samuels SE, Craypo L, Boyle M, Crawford PB, Yancey A, Flores G. The California Endowment's Healthy Eating, Active Communities program: a midpoint review. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100(11):2114–23.
95. Blattberg RC, Briesch R, Fox EJ. How promotions work. *Market Sci* 1995;14(3):G122–G32.
96. Lichtenstein DR, Netemeyer RG, Burton S. Assessing the domain specificity of deal proneness: a field study. *J Cons Res* 1995;22(3):314–26.
97. Reicks M, Splett P, Fishman A. Shelf labeling of organic foods: effects on customer perceptions and sales. 1997; econpapers.repec.org/paper/agsumrfwp/14307.htm.
98. Bell DR, Corsten D, Knox G. From point-of-purchase to path-to-purchase: how pre-shopping factors drive unplanned buying. *J Market* 2011;75(1):31–45.
99. Vyth EL, Steenhuis IHM, Mallant SF, et al. A front-of-pack nutrition logo: a quantitative and qualitative process evaluation in the Netherlands. *J Health Commun* 2009;14(7):631.
100. van Kleef E, van Trijp H, Paeps F, Fernández-Celemín L. Consumer preferences for front-of-pack calories labelling. *Public Health Nutr* 2008;11(2):203–13.
101. Kozup JC, Creyer EH, Burton S. Making healthful food choices: the influence of health claims and nutrition information on consumers' evaluations of packaged food products and restaurant menu items. *J Market* 2003;67(2):19–34.
102. Wansink B, Chandon P. Can "low-fat" nutrition labels lead to obesity? *J Market Res* 2006;43(4):605–17.
103. Jensen J. Children's purchase requests and parental responses: results from an exploratory study in Denmark. *Eur Adv Cons Res* 1995;2:54–60.
104. Ebster C, Wagner U, Neumueller D. Children's influences on in-store purchases. *J Retail Cons Serv* 2009;16(2):145–54.
105. Hawkes C. Food packaging: the medium is the message. *Public Health Nutr* 2010;13(2):297–9.
106. Hunter BT. Marketing food to kids: using fun to sell. *Cons Res* 2002;85(3):16–20.
107. Elliott C. Healthy food looks serious: how children interpret packaged food products. www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewArticle/2220.
108. Harris JL, Schwartz MB, Brownell KD. Marketing foods to children and adolescents: licensed characters and other promotions on packaged foods in the supermarket. *Public Health Nutr* 2010;13(3):409–17.
109. Moreau P, Krishnab A, Harlamc B. The manufacturer-retailer-consumer triad: differing perceptions regarding price promotions. *J Retailing* 2001;77(4):547–69.
110. Ailawadi KL. The retail power-performance conundrum: what have we learned? *J Retailing* 2001;77(3):299–318.
111. Cui TH, Raju JS, Zhang ZJ. A price discrimination model of trade promotions. *Market Sci* 2008;27(5):779–95.
112. Harris JL, Schwartz MB, Brownell KD. *Cereal f.a.c.t.s: nutrition and marketing ratings of children's cereals*. New Haven CT: Yale University, Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity, 2009.
113. Connell D, Goldberg JP, Foltz SC. An intervention to increase fruit and vegetable consumption using audio communications: in-store public service announcements and audiotapes. *J Health Commun* 2001;6(1):31–43.
114. Catalina Marketing. *Helping shoppers overcome the barriers to choosing healthful foods: Catalina Marketing and Food Marketing Institute*, 2010.
115. Glanz K, Sallis JF, Saelens BE, Frank LD. Nutrition Environment Measures Survey in stores (NEMS-S): development and evaluation. *Am J Prev Med* 2007;32(4):282–9.
116. Kerr J, Sallis J, Bromby E, Glanz K. Assessing food promotions in grocery stores: reliability and validity of the GroPromo audit tool. *J Nutr Educ Behav* 2012. In press.
117. Dibb S. *Rating retailers for health: how supermarkets can affect your chances of a healthy diet*. London: National Consumer Council, 2004.
118. Sturm R, Datar A. Body mass index in elementary school children, metropolitan area food prices and food outlet density. *Public Health* 2005;119(12):1059–68.
119. Sturm R, Datar A. Food prices and weight gain during elementary school: 5-year update. *Public Health* 2008;122(11):1140–3.

120. Sturm R, Datar A. Regional price differences and food consumption frequency among elementary school children. *Public Health* 2011;125(3):136-41.
121. Powell LM, Chaloupka FJ. Food prices and obesity: evidence and policy implications for taxes and subsidies. *Milbank Q* 2009;87(1):229-57.
122. Thow AM, Jan S, Leeder S, Swinburn B. The effect of fiscal policy on diet, obesity and chronic disease: a systematic review. *Bull WHO* 2010;88(8):609-14.

Appendix

Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2012.01.013.

A pubcast created by the authors of this paper can be viewed at www.ajpmonline.org/content/video_pubcasts_collection.

Did you know?

The *AJPM* Most Read and Most Cited articles are listed on our home page.

Go to www.ajpmonline.org.

Retail Grocery Store Marketing Strategies and Obesity

An Integrative Review

Karen Glanz, PhD, MPH, Michael D.M. Bader, PhD, Shally Iyer, MPH

Appendix A

Search Terms

Consumer psychology grocery store

Shopping behavior grocery store

Grocery store environment

Corner stores

Atmospherics

Grocery store layout

Healthy checkout aisles

Display marketing food store

Shelf placement in grocery stores

Shelf location in grocery stores

Grocery store slotting fees

Slotting allowances

Signs in grocery stores

Promotions in grocery stores

Point-of-purchase marketing

In-store marketing

Shopper marketing

In-store coupons

Instant coupons

Grocery store coupons

Store loyalty cards

Obesity

Loyalty cards

Display marketing

100 calorie packs

Food packaging

Food price interventions

Food taxes

Appendix B

Glossary of Terms

Category management: employing a single individual who is responsible for a store's product line; usually considered an alternative to brand management in which multiple decision makers act on behalf of a specific brand within the store or firm¹

Character licensing: the association of a food product with a popular character as a promotional strategy²

Cross-promotion: promotion of a good or service coupled with the promotion of another product (e.g., promoting fruits such as bananas or strawberries alongside cereal displays)³

Hedonic goods: goods whose consumption can be characterized as an affective multi-sensory emotional experience that includes pleasant tastes, sounds, scents, tactile impressions, and/or visual images; presentation or promotion is far more subjectively than objectively oriented⁴

Hi-Lo pricing: pricing strategy in which a good or service is priced high and promotional discounts are provided for a period of time ("low pricing") to increase consumer purchasing⁵

Loyalty cards: provided to shoppers who provide a limited amount of personal information and pay lower prices for selected promotional items; consumers who are not loyalty card holders pay higher prices for these items⁶

Price elasticity: Responsiveness of the demand for a good or service to a change in its price; specifically, the unit increase in sales resulting from manipulating a factor (e.g., price, shelf-facings, point-of-purchase information); at the "category-level": relative responsiveness to a change in the price of one category of products (e.g., fruits) relative to another category (e.g., baked goods)⁷

Private label/store brands: products manufactured by and sold at a specific store or chain of stores, as opposed to national brands that are sold across multiple stores and chains⁸

Semiotics/semiotic cues: signs and symbols in labels and other promotional tools, designed to deliver subliminal or latent messages to produce reactions and emotions in the consumer⁹

Shelf-space elasticity: responsiveness of the demand for a good to the amount of shelf-space allocated to that product¹⁰

Slotting allowances (slotting fees): payment by a manufacturer or vendor to a retailer in order to ensure shelf-space in the retailer's store(s) or in its warehouses¹¹

Stockpiling: a large accumulation of goods, in a greater quantity than is immediately needed¹²

Trade deals: sales discounted by a manufacturer to a retailer¹³

Utilitarian goods: goods whose consumption is more cognitively than emotionally driven, is instrumental/goal-oriented, and designed to accomplish a functional or practical task¹⁴

References for Appendix B

1. Zenor MJ. The profit benefits of category management. *J Market Res* 1994;31(2):202–13.
2. Harris JL, Schwartz MB, Brownell KD. Marketing foods to children and adolescents: licensed characters and other promotions on packaged foods in the supermarket. *Public Health Nutr* 2010;13(3):409–17.
3. Drèze X, Hoch SJ. Exploiting the installed base using cross-merchandising and category destination programs. *Int J Res Market* 1998;15(5):459–71.
4. Kahneman D. Maps of bounded rationality: psychology for behavioral economics. *Am Econ Rev* 2003;93(5):1449–75.
5. Kim B-D, Park K. Studying patterns of consumer's grocery shopping trip. *J Retailing* 1997;73(4):501–17.
6. Bellizzi JA, Bristol T. An assessment of supermarket loyalty cards in one major U.S. market. *J Consum Market* 2004;21(2):144–54.
7. Andreyeva T, Long MW, Brownell KD. The impact of food prices on consumption: a systematic review of research on the price elasticity of demand for food. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100(2):216–22.
8. Batra R, Sinha I. Consumer-level factors moderating the success of private label brands. *J Retailing* 2000;76(2):175–91.
9. Ares G, Piqueras-Fiszman B, Varela P, Marco RM, López AM, Fiszman S. Food labels: Do consumers perceive what semiotics want to convey? *Food Qual Pref* 2011;22(7):689–98.
10. Chen M-C, Lin C-P. A data mining approach to product assortment and shelf space allocation. *Expert Syst Appl* 2007;32(4):976–86.
11. Bloom PN, Gundlach GT, Cannon JP. Slotting allowances and fees: schools of thought and the views of practicing managers. *J Market* 2000;64(2):92–108.
12. Chandon P, Wansink B. When are stockpiled products consumed faster? a convenience?salience framework of postpurchase consumption incidence and quantity. *J Market Res* 2002;39(3):321–35.
13. Blattberg RC, Briesch R, Fox EJ. How promotions work. *Market Sci* 1995;14(3):G122–G132.
14. Dhar R, Wertenbroch K. Consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian goods. *J Market Res* 2000;37(1):60–71.