

What's Next for The Boston Beer Company, Inc.?



**SAMUEL
ADAMS**

Brian Barber

Gregory Pearson

Marcia Tatay

Alex Vargo

Revised: 2014 by Marcia
Tatay

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Beer Industry Overview	
Craft Beer industry Overview	
Boston Beer, Inc. Overview	
SWOT Analysis	4
PESTELC Analysis	8
Problem Specifications	11
Management Problem	
Marketing Problems	
Hypotheses	
Set 1: Sales of Boston Beer, Inc. will be predicted by Gross Domestic Product, the sales of Anheuser-Busch, and the sales of the Craft Brew Alliance.	13
Set 2: There is a relationship between Boston Beer's volumes shipped and that of the Craft Brew Alliance and Yuengling.	15
Set 3: If people who like craft beer also said they would change their preference if their beer were no longer labeled as craft, this would show a lack of desire for Samuel Adams.	17
Set 4: People prefer other craft brews over Samuel Adams.	19
Set 5: People will have differing preferences when it comes to the pricing of their beer.	21
Set 6: People's preferences change with an increase in education.	24
Set 7: People's feelings about Samuel Adams will be dependent on the style of beer preferred, the importance of taste and price, their age, their level of education, their relationship status, and their gender.	26
Marketing Mix Analysis	31
Price	
Promotion	
Place	
Product	
Work Cited	33

Introduction

Beer Industry Overview

The beer industry operates in the United States under the NAICS code 312120, Breweries (Gale Group, 2012). Beer was first brewed in America in 1587 in the colony of Roanoke. It has become one of the most popular beverages in the nation- third after water and tea (Gale Group, 2012). The industry produces 180 million barrels of beer every year, with one barrel equaling to two kegs or 31 gallons. The industry created \$94 billion in revenue in 2006 and \$36 billion in business, consumption, and personal taxes that same year. The Brewers Association values the economic impact of the industry at \$189.3 billion (Brewers Association, 2012).

Fourteen percent of the world's beer production is brewed in the United States (Brewers Association, 2012). The top two manufacturers in the U.S. have more than 76% of the market. Anheuser-Busch, which brews the top two brands- Budweiser and Bud Light, holds 47.9% and MillerCoors, which brews third and fourth top selling brands- Miller Light and Coors Light, holds 28.9% of the beer market (Lazich & Burton III, 2012). At the end of 2010, there were a total of 1,693 breweries in the US (Beer Institute, 2011).

Craft Beer Industry Overview

An American craft brewer is defined as being small, independent, and traditional (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

- Small:** In 2011, the Brewer's Association changed the definition of craft brewer from 2 million barrels of production per year to 6 million barrels of production per year (Business and Company Resource Center, 2011).
- Independent:** The distinction of independent is for brewers that have less than 25% of the brewery owned or controlled by an alcoholic beverage industry member who is not themselves a craft brewer (Brewers Association, 2012).
- Traditional:** A traditional brewer has at least 50% of its volume in either all malt beers or in beers which use adjuncts to enhance rather than lighten flavor (Brewers Association, 2012).

In the 1980's, as the large brewers entered maturity, microbrew beers began to crop up. The segment has grown steadily and quickly since. The current market share for the craft segment is 5.7% (by volume) of the US market. More than 95% of the breweries in the US are considered craft brewers (Brewers Association, 2012).

Boston Beer Company, Inc. Overview

Jim Koch founded Boston Beer Company in 1984 with a recipe handed down from his great-great grandfather, Louis Koch- a brewer in the 1870s. In April 1985, Samuel Adams Boston Lager- Boston Beer's flagship beer- debuted in Boston area restaurants and bars. By 1988 sales had grown to 36,000 barrels and the beer was available on both coasts. Currently, Boston Beer, Inc. employs 750, includes more than 30 beer styles, produced 2.3 million barrels in 2010, and trades on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker SAM (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

The beers produced by SAM have won more awards than any other brand in history. In fact, after only six weeks on the market, Samuel Adams Boston Lager won an award for "The Best Beer in America." These award winning brews are created at the company's three locations in Boston, MA, Cincinnati, OH, and Lehigh, PA (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012). The company sells its products in all 50 states and has markets in Canada, Europe, Israel, the Caribbean, the Pacific Rim, and Mexico. In the US where 99% of its products are sold, the company is dependent on a network of approximately 400 wholesale distributors and must compete for these wholesalers' time, energy, and space with the industry giants (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

SWOT Analysis

Strengths

Internal Strengths

Boston Beer, Inc. has strong and confident leadership. The CEO and founder of Boston Beer, Jim Koch, says, "Our beers, our selling styles, and our organizational structure are all testaments to our ability to think and act in new ways" (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012). Mr. Koch is making positive moves for the company with the organizational structure and innovation. Boston Beer, Inc. has a program called Brewing the American Dream that helps small business owners with low to moderate income in the food and beverage industry to create jobs and foster innovation (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Boston Beer has certain competitive advantages over the regional craft brewers, including a long history of awards for product quality, greater available resources and the ability to distribute and promote its products on a more cost-effective basis. They also have competitive advantages over imported beers: lower transportation costs, higher product quality, a lack of import charges and superior product freshness. The company has a low backlog rate that improves their ability to deliver the freshest beer. Most of their core brands are shipped within days (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Wall Street Journal analysts say Boston Beer, the flagship player in the craft category, has a successful multitier research and development, marketing and testing strategy that often begins with experimental, limited-edition beers. The flavors discovered in early development can later be used to make a seasonal brew and, if well received, become an all-year offering. "They are very judicious in how they go about bringing these brands to the market for the full year," said Auriga analyst Gary Albanese. The company can introduce new brands in seasons and later launch them all-year round if all goes well. Albanese said Boston Beer utilizes a different strategy than other brewers when launching new ales, as the company often launches new flavors nationally for a limited amount of time. Competitors often launch a product in a test market and try to gauge if consumers like it (Kell, 2012). This is the key to the introduction of a new brand and very different from how new products are generally introduced.

Financial Strengths

Boston Beer, Inc. has very strong financials. From 2009 to 2010 they had a sales growth of 11.7% and a net income growth of 61.1% (Hoovers: A D&B Company, 2012). They had an amazing return on equity of 26.7% when compared to the industry average of 14.8% (Wilton, 2010).

According to Datamonitor, the company had no long-term debt as of December 2010 and Boston Beer is

the largest craft brewer in the United States. Datamonitor also reported that there was a growth in the number of barrels of beer sold from 2009 to 2010. The company surpassed the two million barrel mark in 2009 and reported 2.3 million in 2010 (Datamonitor, 2012).

Customer Related Strengths

Boston Beer does very well with Households who make over \$50,000 a year. As income level increases, the percentage of survey respondents who prefer Samuel Adams also increases (Simmons Market Research Bureau, 2012). The company has a sales force of 275 people with a high level of product knowledge and trained in the details of the brewing and the selling process (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Weaknesses

Internal Weaknesses

Boston Beer competes for space everywhere. With a network of 400 wholesale distributors, Boston Beer is not the primary brands in the portfolios. Thus in addition to competing with other malt beverages for a share of the *drinkers* business, the company competes with other brewers for a share of the *distributor's* attention, time and selling efforts. They also compete for retailer shelf space, cold box space, and tap space. Not only do they compete for space but also attention. Boston Beer distributes its products through independent distributors who may also distribute competitors' products. Certain brewers have contracts with their distributors that impose requirements that are intended to maximize the wholesalers' attention, time and selling efforts on that brewer's products. These contracts generally result in increased competition among brewers as the contracts may affect the manner in which a distributor allocates selling effort and investment to the brands included in its portfolio (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Financial Weaknesses

Currently Boston Beer's profit margin is thinner than the industry average; Boston Beer's is 9.8% and the industry average is 11.4% (Wilton, 2010). Another issue is the rising cost of raw materials. According to Datamonitor prices could increase by nearly 10-15% during 2011- prices of barley increased from \$189.6 per metric ton in December 2010 to \$210.2 per metric ton by June 2011- that is a 10.9% increase (Datamonitor, 2012).

Customer Related Weaknesses

According to Kimberly Palmer of usnews.com Boston Beer brews are perceived as luxury beers, which shy some customers away from buying the beer (Palmer, 2008). This could be tested to see if the brand image is important to current customers. Boston Beer does not do well with

households that earn less than \$50,000, and when analyzed by age (21-24), Boston Beer lags behind MillerCoors (Simmons Market Research Bureau, 2012). Can the company convince consumers to spend the extra 2-3 dollars per six-pack on a regular basis?

Opportunities

Internal Opportunities

In 2010 the company entered into a five-year distribution agreement with Moosehead Brewery where Moosehead will assume the Canadian distribution of Boston Beer's portfolio. This will enable Boston Beer to establish a strong footprint and increase revenues and profitability by using Canada's largest independent brewery. Also in 2010 there was a 1-2% decline in overall beer sales; however, the craft beer category grew approximately 10-12%. As the largest craft brewer in the US, the company is well positioned to exploit the growing category (Datamonitor, 2012).

External Opportunities

Also in 2011 Boston Beer collaborated with Dogfish Head brewers. This collaboration was unique, however, as it made "beer nerds" sit up and take notice, it has opened the door to further collaborations (Ewalt, Dogfish Head and Boston Beer Meet in SAVOR Flowers, 2011).

Financial Opportunities

The company should be producing higher profit margins; this is a chance to grow. Although crafts are more expensive, they also tend to produce higher profit margins. Craft drinkers are the type of people owners want in their bar- the average craft drinker spends \$60.16 per check on food and drinks, compared to \$44.18 for the average premium light-beer drinker (Schultz, 2011).

According to Simmons analysis, Boston Beer has an opportunity to expand their market share by targeting households that make more than \$50,000 or they could attempt to enter the market of cheaper beer and target those households that make less than \$50,000 (Simmons Market Research Bureau, 2012).

Threats

Internal Threats

The company currently has brewing and packaging services arrangements with MillerCoors, Nestle Professional Vitality and Pleasant Valley Wine Company to brew and/or package its core brands. While distribution agreements contain provisions giving the company enforcement and termination rights, some state laws prohibit the company from exercising these contractual rights. If the company's existing distribution agreements are terminated, it may not be able to enter into new

distribution and brewing agreements on substantially similar terms, which may result in an increase in the costs of distribution (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

The craft category is highly competitive with similar pricing and target drinkers. Not only is the craft category competitive, but macrobrewers like MillerCoors and Anheuser Busch InBev have entered the category, either by developing their own beers, acquiring, in whole or part, existing craft brewers, importing and distributing foreign brewers' brands or increasing their development and marketing efforts on their own beers that might compete. The company also faces strong competition from Anheuser Busch InBev and MillerCoors as they introduce new domestic specialty and "faux craft" brands and expand their efforts behind existing brands (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Financial Threats

The amount of advertising is one concern for the company. With \$1.2 billion in measured media spent on beer in 2010, 86% was spent by three brewers: Anheuser Busch, MillerCoors and Heineken (Schultz, 2011).

The beer industry has seen continued consolidation among brewers, including the joint venture between SABMiller and Molson Coors and the acquisition of Anheuser Busch by InBev, both in 2008, and the acquisition of FEMSA Cerveza by Heineken in 2010. Due to the increased leverage that these combined operations will have, the costs to the company of competing could increase and the availability of brewing capacity could be reduced (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Other companies are moving in on the company's image and territory. Jon Newberry of the Dayton Business Journal believes Yuengling has surpassed Boston Beer as the largest American owned brewery even though they are only sold in 14 states (Newberry, 2012). This is a problem for Boston Beer's image as the number one craft brewer in the United States.

Customer Threats

Are customers into craft beer? Are they drinking enough? Crafts are higher in price, calories and alcohol. Based on a MillerCoors survey, the average mainstream light-beer drinker had 11.8 servings per week, compared with 8.5 for craft beer (Schultz, 2011).

PESTELC Analysis

Political

The manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages is a highly regulated and taxed business. Regulations become more restrictive each year, along with increased taxation from federal, state, and local governments. Some counties are declared dry- where alcohol sales are not allowed within the county. Regulation includes permits, licenses, trade practices, labeling, advertising, marketing, distributor relationships, and other related matters. Failure to comply with any of these regulations results in higher taxes, penalties, fees, and suspension or revocation of permits, licenses, or approvals. There is no assurance against further regulation and taxation in the future (Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 2014).

Before the 2011 change, brewers that produce more than 2.0 million barrels of domestic consumption beer in a calendar year, the federal excise tax is \$18.00 per barrel produced. Individual states also impose excise taxes in varying amounts and with varying determination of which party pays the tax (brewery or distributor), which are subject to change. Twisted Tea is classified as a malt beverage for federal excise tax purposes, however, in some states, Twisted Tea and hard cider may be taxed at a higher rate (The federal excise tax on hard cider is \$0.226 per gallon.) (Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 2014).

Another political issue is foreign trade policies and their effect on Boston Beer's supply chain. A trade embargo against Canada, the Czech Republic, or Germany, would adversely affect Boston Beer in the short term. Boston Beer has other suppliers that could step up if needed, but there would be lag time between Boston Beer putting in an order, and new suppliers getting the ingredients to them (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Economic

There is no assurance of continued growth. The development of new products, meeting production goals, and obtaining quality ingredients, all help mitigate this risk, but the risk still exists (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

By brewing its core brands in its own breweries, Boston Beer has a high capital cost and a large fixed cost burden. Since 2007, when they changed their strategy and began brewing 95% of their beverages themselves, the cost of owning, operating, and maintaining the breweries has shifted from the separate breweries to Boston Beer, increasing the complexity of the business (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

In 2010, Boston Beer changed their strategy again. Before this change, wholesalers would carry 3-5 weeks of packaged inventory and 3-5 weeks of draft inventory. Boston Beer implemented the Freshest Beer Program in the hopes of reducing inventory by approximately 2 weeks. While this has the potential to increase wholesaler relations and improve freshness perception by the consumer, it comes with increased costs to Boston Beer and increased freight expense to wholesalers of \$1.2 million (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Prices for energy and agricultural products may rise faster than current estimates, causing deficits in the company's estimates of margins.

Social

Consumer demands change, especially flavor preferences. Boston Beer relies heavily on beer flavor as a sustainable competitive advantage (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012). In order to maintain this advantage, Boston Beer must stay informed on current and emerging trends.

Recently, the FDA informed the alcohol industry that they have not approved the use of caffeine in alcohol products. This is currently only affecting alcoholic drinks with added caffeine. Twisted Tea and certain other craft beers from Boston Beer contain naturally-occurring caffeine, so the current regulations do not apply (FDA, 2013). However, this does not mean that future regulation won't require a change of ingredients in some of Boston Beer's products.

Samuel Adams has an easy to use interactive website www.samadams.com. Here you will be able to find out about the aforementioned Brewing the American Dream program and a contest called the Longshot American Homebrew Contest, which is an annual competition that home brewers and employees of Samuel Adams can enter. (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Environment

Boston Beer's malts come from the U.S. and Canada. According to their 10-k, the barley crop in both nations was slightly below the 10-year averages in both quantity and quality. The Company uses one supplier of malt and currently has a multi-year contract with that supplier (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

The Company uses a brand of hops called Noble hops for its Samuel Adams lagers. This brand of hops is found primarily in Germany and the Czech Republic. They are rare and more expensive than other species of hops. Boston Beer currently has purchase commitments with four hops dealers, who have contracts with the hops farmers. (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

This shows Boston Beer's heavy reliance on a limited number of suppliers. The company is exposed to risks due to the quality of the barley and hops crop each year. The Company has names of

other suppliers that could step in if needed, but that could void any future contract with their current suppliers. Also, the Noble hops come from a region that is susceptible to bad weather and fertilizer and pesticide use that do not conform to U.S. regulations. Export restrictions could also cause a shortage of supply for Boston Beer. In order to reduce these risks, Boston Beer tries to maintain at least one year's supply on-hand at several different cold storage warehouses to minimize the impact of a catastrophe at one location, which increases the company's inventory costs substantially (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Legal

Boston Beer is considering pursuing a claim against the manufacturer of the glass bottles that were subject to a product recall in 2008. At this time, no such claim has been made formally (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Boston Beer is currently not allowed to brew beer at the Rochester Brewery due to an ongoing dispute. In January 2011, an arbitrator issued an award of \$1.3 million in damages and expenses to be paid by High Falls Brewery Company, who is likely to file bankruptcy to avoid payment of the award. In 2009, Boston Beer was informed that the High Falls brewery in Rochester, New York, changed owners and the new owners would not assume the company's existing contract. Brewing of Boston Beer's products in Rochester ceased in April, 2009 (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012). Jim Koch holds 100% of the outstanding shares of the company Class B Common Stock, giving him significant influence and control over the company (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Competition

The macrobrewers brands are consolidating and becoming huge international conglomerates. In doing so, they are increasing their available resources, making it harder to compete against them. New competition within the industry arrives almost daily, and the potential for a competitor to steal Boston Beer's target market is tangible. Boston Beer must continue to adapt or get left behind. Also, if beer companies are consolidating, Boston Beer must be open and receptive to the potential for their company to consolidate, adding resources while maintaining the company's identity (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012).

Problem Specifications

Managerial Problem:

The beer industry has seen growth stagnate over the last few years with the exception of one segment: Craft Beer. Boston Beer was the largest American- owned craft brewer until this year when they were surpassed by rival Yuengling (Newberry, 2012). This highlights the problem that has been afflicting them since 2008. Boston Beer has gone from commanding 27.5% of Craft Beer sales to 22.8% in 2010 while the Craft Beer Segment grew in volume share of the overall beer industry from 4.04% to 4.89% over the same time period (Planes, 2011). In short, Boston Beer has been losing market share to other craft brewers as the segment grows.

Even though Boston Beer has been losing ground in market share, they have been increasing sales revenues, up approximately 148% over the recent 10 year period (2001-2010) (Bloomberg LP, 2012). While that may seem good, consider that the Craft Brew Alliance has increased profits by approximately 269% over only a 5 year period (2006-2010) (Bloomberg LP, 2012). This illustrates that yet again, Boston Beer is being outperformed by other craft breweries. What can Boston Beer do to regain their position as the largest American- owned craft brewery?

Marketing Problems:

- 1.** There is a possibility that Samuel Adams (Boston Beer) has taken a hit on their image over the years due to their growth. In 2011 the Craft Brewery Association and the U.S. Government decided to change the volume categories that draw the line between micro-breweries, craft-breweries, and macro-breweries (Brewers Association, 2012). This allowed Boston Beer to keep their craft brewery status as it increased their shipping volumes. Have increased shipping volumes had a negative impact on the sales of Boston Beer or will they in the future?
- 2.** Beyond the concern over the image of the company, we must try to determine how Boston Beer can increase their volumes and in turn their revenue at a pace that meets or exceeds others in the craft brewing segment. As Boston Beer has stagnating market share we must focus on expanding the market in, as well as beyond, their base of individuals in the age range of 35-59 (index of 109 per Simmons), males (index of 145 per Simmons), those who have a Bachelor's Degree or Graduate Degree (indices of 188 and 229 respectively per Simmons), and those who earn over \$100k per year (index of 186 per Simmons). Market segments that have potential for expansion include females (index of 58 per Simmons), individuals with 1-3 years of college experience (index of 92 per Simmons)

as well as those who earn \$50-100k per year (index of 105 per Simmons) (Simmons Market Research Bureau, 2012).

Research Objectives

We are curious to know whether or not the increased shipping volumes had a negative impact on how craft drinkers viewed Samuel Adams. This could be a possible reason as to why other craft breweries are increasing sales at such a higher rate. More importantly, we would like to know how craft drinkers view growth so that we can determine our future strategy. If Boston Beer became a macro-brewery, would their customers view them negatively?

In order to determine what strategy will best increase market share, we must determine what is important to those whom we plan to target. For example, at what price point will a targeted individual buy more of our product? By collecting primary data on craft and non-craft beer drinkers alike, we can begin to answer most of these questions through a statistical analysis of the data.

Hypothesis

Set 1

Sales of Boston Beer, Inc. will be predicted by Gross Domestic Product, the sales of Anheuser-Busch, and the sales of the Craft Brew Alliance.

Intuition:

Boston Beer, Inc. (SAM) has had decreasing market share in the craft brew industry even as the craft segment has increased its market share (Planes, 2011). Is the sales of SAM, and ultimately its market share, a function of BUD sales, craft sales and GDP? Which of these is the strongest predictor?

Looking at market share, we can see that the Craft Brew Alliance (BREW) has increased their share over a three year period (2008 to 2010), as mentioned in the management problem, while SAM had a drop in market share over the same period (Planes, 2011). This leads us to believe that the sales revenues of BREW will be a negatively significant predictor.

When the GDP rises, so should the sales of beer and therefore so should the sales of SAM. Based on the GDP numbers for 2008 to 2010, SAM sales increase and decrease with the GDP.

Budweiser is the leader in market share in the beer industry as a whole. SAM is expanding in the craft market and moving towards the macro-brewer status. If SAM and BUD are going for the same customers there will be a negatively significant relationship.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between SAM, BUD, BREW, and GDP.

H_a: SAM will be positively predicted by GDP; SAM will be negatively predicted by BUD and BREW.

Results:

Looking at the ANOVA table we can see that the predictors are significant overall ($p=.006<.05$), so we can go on to see which of the individual predictors are significant. The linear regression shows that the constant, BUD, and BREW are not significant ($p=.077, .377, .542>.05$) and GDP is significant ($p=.029<.05$). Looking at the model summary table we can see that the significance is strong ($R=.792>.3$). Lastly looking at the coefficients we can see that there is a baseline of -209.745 for SAM and that GDP is positively predictive with a coefficient of .020. The equation for predicting SAM would therefore look like this:

$$SAM = .020 * GDP$$

Conclusion:

Based on the above information, both the null and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected.

Because the null hypothesis stated that there would be no significance it can be rejected because there is significance with the GDP. Because the alternative hypothesis stated that there would be a significant relationship with all variables however, the only variable that was a significant predictor was the GDP. The GDP was a significant positive predictor as our intuition stated.

Follow-up:

We would like to be able to further analyze Boston Beer's sales against their competitors in the craft segment; however, as they are not publicly traded companies, this data was not available to us. We were able to find a database with the Craft Brew Alliance that would contain this information. Going forward we would like to purchase a membership (\$155 for one year) in order to gain access to the information. The database includes historical and current data that could prove useful to the analysis we are performing.

Hypothesis

Set 2

There is a relationship between Boston Beer's volumes shipped and that of the Craft Brew Alliance and Yuengling.

Intuition:

As market share is computed by volume shipped, it would follow that we should compare the volumes of Craft Brew Alliance (BREW) and Yuengling (YING) to that of Boston Beer (SAM). Since we were unable to get sales revenue figures from YING, a privately-owned company, comparing their volumes to SAM should give us an idea of how the two are related. Because YING is SAM's largest competitor in the craft brew segment (Newberry, 2012), we can infer that their volumes are negatively related. Similarly, as BREW has gained market share while Boston Beer has lost ground (BREW up 1.11%, SAM down 4.71%) (Planes, 2011), we can infer they are negatively related as well.

H₀: There is no relationship between SAM's volumes shipped to those of YING and BREW.

H_a: YING's and BREW's volumes shipped will be negatively related to those of SAM.

Results:

There are 10 data points for Boston Beer and Yuengling and 9 data points for the Craft Brew Alliance. There is a significant correlation between YING ($p=.000<.05$) and BREW ($p=.003<.05$). There is a strong correlation between SAM and both YING and BREW ($r=.907$ and $.862>.3$).

Conclusion:

As there is a significant, positive, and strong correlation between the volumes of these three companies, we reject both H_0 and H_a . Even though Boston Beer has been losing market share, they have still been increasing their volumes shipped along with the other 2 companies. What we can infer from this is that Boston Beer's loss of market share may be spread across a large number of smaller breweries as opposed to a few. This supports the need for further research into the deeper problem that although the craft industry is growing, Boston Beer is behind their competitors in growth rate.

Follow-up:

Boston Beer faces competition from the large domestic brands as well as from imports. MillerCoors owns craft brew staples such as Leinenkugel and Blue Moon while Budweiser has used Michelob to release more flavorful brews like Amber Bock and Shock Top. Similarly, import beers are perceived to

have the fuller flavor associated with craft beers. According to the Brewers Association, Import beer sales made up approximately 13% of the overall U.S. beer market in 2010 and have been rising (Brewers Association, 2012). Since Imports and Craft Beer sales have been trending upward while the overall industry has been moving down, Boston Beer and Import sales (represented by Crown Imports which sells Corona (CROWN) and Heineken USA (HEI)) will be positively related to each other and negatively related to Budweiser (BUD) and MillerCoors (MIL).

H0: There is no significant relationship between the volume sales of SAM, CROWN, HEI, BUD, and MIL.

Ha: CROWN and HEI will be positively correlated to the volume sales of SAM and negatively correlated to the volume sales of BUD and MIL.

Results:

There are 10 data points for each BUD, MIL, SAM, CROWN, and HEI. There was no significant correlation with SAM and BUD ($p=.077>.05$) and MIL ($p=.203>.05$). There was significant correlation between SAM and CROWN ($p=.000<.05$) and HEI ($p=.001<.05$). The significance of the correlation between SAM and CROWN is strong ($r=.948>.3$) and the significance between SAM and HEI is also strong ($r=.876>.3$).

Conclusion:

Although Crown Imports and Heineken USA are positively correlated to the sales volumes of Boston Beer, they are not significantly related to the sales volumes of Budweiser or MillerCoors. Therefore we must reject H_0 and H_a . One possible reason that import sales volumes are not significantly related to Budweiser or MillerCoors could be due to the phenomena that we have witnessed between Boston Beer and the other members of the Craft Segment. That is that while sales volumes have remained relatively stagnant for the two, their woes are not necessarily attributable to a few companies, but to a much larger trend of beer drinkers that are increasing the diversity of their choices.

Follow-up:

As we were initially only concerned with the domestic sales of Boston Beer and its domestic competitors, we did not do further research on the import sales. Going forward we would like to understand more fully the relationship between imports and Boston Beer as well as the craft segment as a whole.

Hypothesis

Set 3

If people who like craft beer also said they would change their preference if their beer were no longer labeled as craft, this would show a lack of desire for Samuel Adams.

Intuition:

“Sam Adams—despite its small scale relative to the major players—is by now ubiquitous enough that most people don’t consider it a ‘craft’ brew” (Planes, 2011). In 2011 (coincidentally, the same year that Boston Beer, Inc. surpassed 2 million barrels), the Brewers Association changed its specifications for craft brewer classification which allowed Samuel Adams (SAM) to retain its status as a craft brewer. Based on anecdotal evidence (Planes, 2011), this was seen as an attempt by SAM to maintain its craft image. Therefore we believe people who prefer craft and would change their preference if the classification changed (CF) will not like SAM.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between CF and SAM.

H_a: There will be a significantly negative correlation between CF and SAM.

Results:

There were 30 respondents that answered both questions. Looking at the significance of the correlation, we can see that the two variables are not significantly correlated ($p=.117>.05$). From these results the alternative hypothesis, which stated that there would be a significant correlation between the two variables, can be rejected. We can therefore accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between changing preference and liking Samuel Adams.

Conclusion:

There is no significant relationship between people who would change their beer preference based on craft distinction and how much the respondents like Samuel Adams. Based on these results, our intuition was incorrect and people who drink craft and would change preference due to classification will not necessarily dislike Samuel Adams.

Follow-up:

Because of the above results we could surmise that people that like craft beers will also like Samuel Adams. This would indicate that craft drinkers do not care about the volume of the brewery, and

therefore the classification of the beer. Would there be a significant positive relationship between beer drinkers who like other craft beer (OCB) and beer drinkers who like Samuel Adams (SAM)?

H0: There will be no significant correlation between OCB and SAM.

Ha: There will be a significant positive correlation between OCB and SAM.

Results:

There were 58 respondents that answered both questions. Looking at the significance of the correlation we can see that the two variables are significantly correlated ($p=.002<.05$). Looking at the Pearson Correlation, we can see that there is a strong, positive relationship between the variables ($r=.394>.3$).

Conclusion:

Based on the above results we can reject the null hypothesis which stated that there would be no significant correlation. We can therefore accept the alternative hypothesis which stated that there would be a significant positive correlation.

We can therefore state that, based on these results, current Samuel Adams drinkers will not care if the company were to increase its volume and no longer be considered a craft brew.

Follow-up:

Going forward we would like to study the regular craft brew drinkers to better understand their preferences and purchasing behavior.

Hypothesis

Set 4

People prefer other craft brews over Samuel Adams.

Intuition:

Given that the craft industry as a whole is growing at a faster pace than Boston Beer (Planes, 2011), we could infer that the mean of people who like Samuel Adams (SAM) is lower than the mean of people who like other craft brews (CFT).

H0: There will be no significant difference in the means of SAM and CFT.

Ha: The mean of SAM will be significantly lower than the mean of CFT.

Results:

There were 58 respondents to both questions. CFT had a mean of 3.25 and SAM had a mean of 3.10. Looking at the paired samples test table we can see that the difference between the two means is insignificant ($p=.418>.05$). While the mean for CFT is larger, it is not significantly larger.

Conclusion:

Since there is no significant difference, we accept H_0 and reject H_a . Earlier we saw a positive correlation between other craft beers and Sam Adams among our respondents. What we see here is that on average, our respondents like Sam Adams just as much as they like other craft beers. While this goes against our research, it may be due to our relatively small number of respondents and limited geographical reach.

Follow-up:

Because Budweiser and MillerCoors are the leaders in the industry (Lazich & Burton III, 2012), we think the mean of people who like them will be above 3.5.

H0: There will be no significant difference in the mean of how people feel about Budweiser and 3.5.

Ha: The mean of how people feel about Budweiser will be significantly above 3.5.

H0: There will be no significant difference in the mean how people feel about MillerCoors.

Ha: The mean of how people feel about MillerCoors will be significantly above 3.5.

Results:

There were 60 respondents to the question. There was a mean of 3.4333 and a test value of 3.5.

Looking at the one-sample test table we can see that the mean is not significantly different from the test value ($p=.697>.05$).

There were 60 respondents to the question. There was a mean of 3.5 and a test value of 3.5. Looking at the one-sample test table we can see that there is no significant difference between the mean and the test value ($p=1>.05$).

Conclusion:

Because the means for both questions were not significantly different from the test value of 3.5 we can reject both alternative hypotheses and accept both null hypotheses. We can see that on average people surveyed felt just higher than neutral (“eh”) about both of the beers. The fact that the means of these two questions were not significantly more than 3.5 could be explained by the fact that many of the respondents were extreme when answering these questions: meaning that if they loved Miller they hated Budweiser and vice versa.

Follow-up:

Going forward, we would like to perform another survey in which we asked respondents their preferences based on three categories: Macrobrew, Craft, and Import. This would likely eliminate some of the brand specific problems we have had in these tests.

Hypothesis

Set 5

People will have differing preferences when it comes to the pricing of their beer.

Intuition:

In order to figure out how we can effectively advertise to different markets, we must first understand what is important to each of them. According to Simmons, individuals 35-60 are our strongest market and those 25-35 are a potential growth market (Simmons Market Research Bureau, 2012). We would like to see whether or not there is a difference in how these two groups feel about different price points. Since younger individuals typically make less money, we believe they will be more affected by changes in price than the older individuals.

H0: There will be no significant difference in the means of the price differences between the two age ranges.

Ha: The mean of the price differences will be significantly higher for individuals 25-34 than those 35-60.

Results:

There were 21 respondents aged 25-34 to both questions and 19 respondents aged 35-60. The mean of 25-34 year olds for \$1 is 3.0476 while the mean for 35-60 is 1.6842. The mean of 25-34 for \$2 is 3.3333 while the mean for 35-60 is 1.9474. By looking at the Levene's test for the equality of variances for \$1, we see that the variances are not significantly different ($p=.735>.05$) so we can look at the equal variances assumed numbers. Looking at the t-test significance we can see that the means are significantly different ($p=.001<.05$). In the test for \$2, the Levene's test shows us that the variances are not significantly different ($p=.966>.05$) so we look at the equal variances assumed. We see that the means are significantly different ($p=.004<.05$).

Conclusion:

As expected, individuals 25-34 had a significantly higher mean response to our price points than those 35-60 and therefore we can reject H_0 and accept H_a . We also notice that the means for both age ranges are slightly higher for the \$2 price decrease than for the \$1.

Follow-up:

We should run a test to determine whether or not the mean of the \$2 price decrease is significantly different than the mean for the \$1 decrease. This test will take into account all respondents and will give us an idea of how the price decreases affect everyone.

H₀: There will be no significant difference in the means of the \$1 price decrease and the \$2 price decrease.

H_a: There will be a significant difference in the means of the \$1 and \$2 price decreases.

Results:

There were 60 respondents to both questions. The mean for the \$1 question is 2.4333 and the mean for the \$2 question is 2.8667. We can see that there is a significant difference between these two means ($p=.000<.05$).

Conclusion:

There is a significant difference in the means of the \$1 and \$2 price decreases. We will reject H_0 and accept H_a . Unfortunately the means are lower than 3 which indicate that overall, people were not influenced by the price points. What this means for us is that while the price change could affect 25-34 year olds, it may have little effect on others.

Follow-up:

In conjunction with price, we are interested to know if different packaging concepts will be more effective in increasing our sales within our two possible target age ranges. By offering a more convenient and cheaper 4 pack, we hope to appeal to price conscious and lighter drinkers. We also would like to consider offering Sam Adams in a min-keg, that holds approximately 14 beers, or in a simple 12 oz. aluminum can. We hope the min-keg appeals to those who prefer draught beer and would like the convenience of having it at home. Similarly, we feel that packaging our beer in cans may appeal to other people for various reasons. For example, there are those that believe beer is better out of a can because it is completely shielded from air and light, two enemies of beer (Boston Beer Co, Inc., 2012). As we have already shown, consumers 25-34 are more influenced by price and will likely be more likely to change their habits than those 35-60.

H₀: There will be no significant difference in the mean between those 25-34 and 35-60 regarding how much they like the option of a cheaper 4 pack, a mini-keg, and cans.

Ha: Individuals 25-34 will be significantly more interested in the option of a cheaper 4 pack, a mini-keg, and cans than individuals 35-60.

Results:

There were 21 respondents aged 25-34 and 17 respondents aged 35-60. The mean for 25-34 year olds for the four-pack question was 2.9524 while the mean for 35-60 was 1.9412. The mean for the 25-34 year olds for the mini-keg question was 2.8095 while the mean for 35-60 was 1.7059. The mean for the 25-34 year olds for the cans question was 2.4762 while the mean for 35-60 was 1.6471. Looking at the Levene's test for equality of variances we can see that there is no significant difference in the variances for any of the questions ($p=.316, .117, .410>.05$) so we will assume equal variances and use the corresponding information. The means of the four-pack are significantly different ($p=.018<.05$). The means of the mini-keg question are also significantly different ($p=.032<.05$). The means of the cans question are significantly different ($p=.040<.05$).

Conclusion:

By examining the results, we can see that individuals 25-34 are significantly more likely to be interested in all three different packaging options than those 35-60. For this reason we reject H_0 and accept H_a . There is one caveat to our results; the means for individuals 25-34 are all below 3. This would indicate that overall, those 25-34 are not likely to change their purchasing habits based on changes in packaging. It would be our recommendation that Boston Beer focus more on lowering prices to appeal to individuals 25-34 in order to increase sales volumes.

Follow-up:

A survey of greater magnitude may reveal more helpful data in terms of packaging.

Hypotheses

Set 6

People's preferences change with an increase in education.

Intuition:

Per Simmons Samuel Adams has room to grow with individuals who have some college experience and has a strong base with those who have a degree (Simmons Market Research Bureau, 2012). We would like to see how individuals in these two groups respond to different price points of Samuel Adams. Individuals with some college experience are likely to still be in school and therefore make less money than individuals who already have their degree.

H₀: There will be no significant difference in the means of the price differences between individuals with some college experience and those who have earned their degree.

H_a: The mean of the price differences will be significantly higher for individuals with some college experience than those who have already earned their degree.

Results:

There were 24 respondents with some college experience and 19 respondents with an associates or bachelor degree. The means for the \$1 question for some college was 3.0417 and for associates or bachelor 2.0526. The means for the \$2 question for some college was 3.5000 and for associates or bachelor 2.3158. Looking at the Levene's test for equality of variances we can see that the variances are not significantly different ($p=.873$, $.731>.05$) so equal variance will be assumed and we will use the corresponding information. The difference in the means for some college and associates or bachelor of the \$1 question is significant ($p=.014<.05$). The difference in the means for some college and associates or bachelor of the \$2 question is also significant ($p=.007<.05$).

Conclusion:

Because the means are significantly different we reject H_0 and accept H_a . As we expected, individuals with some college experience are more influenced by changes in price than those with a Degree.

Follow-up:

Along with price, we are interested to know how different packaging options will affect these individuals. If we can determine a packaging option that is appealing to either of them, we may be able to increase our sales volumes. We might assume that those with a degree would be more interested in the 4 pack because they may be lighter drinkers than their counterparts with some college experience who will likely be more interested in mini-kegs and cans.

H₀: There will be no significant difference in the means of interest in a 4 pack, mini-keg, or cans between those with some college experience and those with a degree.

H_a: Those with a degree will have a significantly higher interest in 4 packs and significantly lower interest in mini-kegs and cans than those with some college experience.

Results:

There were 22 respondents that had some college experience and 19 respondents with an associates or bachelor degree. The means for the four-pack question was 2.7273 for some college and 2.5263 for associates or bachelor. The means for the mini-keg question was 2.8636 for some college and 2.0000 for associates or bachelor. The means for the cans question was 2.5455 for some college and 1.9474 for associates or bachelor. Looking at the Levene's test for equality of variances we can see that the variances are not significantly different ($p=.651, .526, .815 > .05$). We will, therefore, assume equal variances and use the corresponding information. The means for all three questions were not significantly different ($p=.617, .075, .114$).

Conclusion:

According to the data, there is no significance between the two groups and their interest in any of the different packaging options. Because of this, we must reject H_a and accept H₀. Again we see that price, not packaging is what influences these possible target groups.

Follow-up:

If we could create another survey we could ask about other packaging options that may be appealing to potential customers like aluminum bottles for example.

Hypothesis

Set 7

People's feelings about Samuel Adams will be dependent on the style of beer preferred, the importance of taste and price, their age, their level of education, their relationship status, and their gender.

Intuition:

Finally, we would like to see if any of our psychographic or demographic variables can predict how much a person likes Samuel Adams. We expect to see significant correlations regarding the style of beer preferred, the importance of taste and price, the age of an individual, and their level of education with how much someone likes Samuel Adams. Other variables will be measured but we do not expect to see any significant correlations between them and Samuel Adams.

H0: There will be no significant correlation between the style of the beer preferred, the importance of taste and price, the age of an individual, or their level of education with how much an individual likes Sam Adams.

Ha: The style of beer preferred, importance of taste and price, the age of an individual, and their level of education will all have significant correlations to how much an individual likes Sam Adams.

Results:

Looking at the significance of the correlations with respondents feelings on Samuel Adams we can see that there is a significant correlation with light beer preference, ale preference, lager preference, stout preference, and relationship status ($p=.016, .017, .000, .007, .019<.05$). We can see that there is no significant correlation with importance of taste, importance of price, importance of image, importance of brewer location, age, whether the respondent is currently a student, level of education, and gender ($p=.977, .471, .798, .287, .987, .737, .067, .453>.05$). There is a significantly strong and negative correlation with light beer preference and relationship status ($r=-.311, -.302<-.300$). There is a significantly strong and positive correlation with ale preference, lager preference, and stout preference ($r=.310, .463, .348>.300$).

Conclusion:

As expected the style of beer preferred has a significant correlation to how much a person likes Sam Adams. Unexpectedly, the only demographic variable with a significant correlation was a person's relationship status. Because none of the other variables were significantly correlated as we thought they may be we must reject H_0 and H_a .

Follow-up:

Now that we have seen which variables are significantly correlated to how much a person likes Samuel Adams, we should attempt to see if any of those variables can predict how much a person likes Samuel Adams. It is our expectation that preferring light beers and a person's relationship status will be significant negative predictors while preferring ales, lagers, or stouts will be significant positive predictors.

H_0 : There will be no significant predictors of how much a person likes Samuel Adams.

H_a : Preferring light beers and a person's relationship status will be significant negative predictors and preferring ales, lagers, and stouts will be significant positive predictors of how much a person likes Samuel Adams.

Results:

Looking at the ANOVA table we can see that the predictors are significant overall ($p=.000<.05$) so we can go on to look at the individual significance. Looking at the coefficients table we can see that the constant, lager preference, stout preference, and relationship status are all marginally significant at 90% significance ($p=.013, .039, .029, .016<.100$). Looking at the model summary table we can see that the predictors are strong ($R=.592>.3$). Lastly, looking at the coefficients we can see that the constant creates a baseline at 2.237. The coefficient for lager is .336, for stout is .236, and for relationship status is -.718. The equation for an individual's feelings on Samuel Adams will look like:

$$SAM = 2.237 + .336 * Lager + .236 * Stout - .718 * Status$$

Conclusion:

Against our intuition, preference for light beers and ales were not significant predictors of how much a person likes Samuel Adams. The effect a preference for ales makes on how much a person likes Sam Adams may be mostly explained by how much a person likes lagers or stouts and therefore it is not significant. The effect preference for light beers has on how much a person likes Sam Adams may be diminished due to the fact that some people may confuse the difference between ales and light beers

which may also be another explanation for why the effect of ales was diminished. We believe that relationship status had a negative effect on how much a person likes Samuel Adams because of the way the data were coded. People married/living together were coded as “1”, single people and people who are divorced/widowed were coded as “2”. This would indicate that married individuals were more likely to prefer Sam Adams than the others. Although the preferences for lagers and stouts were positive predictors and relationship status was a negative predictor, because preference for ales and light beers were not, we must reject H_0 and H_a .

Follow-up:

Because relationship status played such a significant part in how much a person likes Sam Adams we would be remiss if we did not look at how people married/living together responded to changes in price. We would expect people that are married/living together would be more affected by price changes due to the fact that they are more likely to have dependents and be living on a budget.

H_0 : There will be no significant difference in how people who are married/living together and people who were not currently married or living together responded to a \$1 and \$2 price decrease respectively.

H_a : People who are married/living together will be more affected by price changes than people who are not married/living together.

Results:

There were 31 respondents that were single/widowed/divorced and 29 respondents who were married/living with someone. The mean for the \$1 question was 2.1935 for single and 2.6897 for married or living with someone. The mean for the \$2 question was 2.7097 for single and 3.0345 for married or living with someone. Looking at the Levene’s test for equality of variances for the \$1 question we see that it is not significant ($p=.096>.05$) so we will assume the variances are equal and use the corresponding information. Looking at the Levene’s test for equality of variances for the \$2 question we see that it is not significant ($p=.825>.05$) so we will assume the variances are equal and use the corresponding information. We can see that the means for both questions are not significantly different ($p=.159, .410>.05$).

Conclusion:

Against our intuition, there is no significant difference in the way these two groups respond to changes in price. This may be explained by the possibility that a person's relationship status does not affect their discretionary spending habits.

Follow-up:

We would also be interested to see if any of our packaging options appeal more to those who are married/living together than those who are not. We believe people that are married/living together will be more interested in our different packaging options than those who are not due to the fact that being married/living together increases how much a person likes Sam Adams.

H₀: There will be no significant difference in the mean between those who are married/living together and those who are not regarding how much they like the option of a cheaper 4 pack, a mini-keg, and cans.

H_a: There will be a significant difference in the mean between those who are married/living together and those who are not regarding how much they like the option of a cheaper 4 pack, a mini-keg, and cans.

Results:

There were 30 respondents that were single and 27 respondents that were married or living with someone. The mean for the four-pack question was 2.9667 for single and 2.8519 for married or living with someone. The mean for the mini-keg question was 3.0000 for single and 2.5185 for married or living with someone. The means for the cans question was 2.1333 for not married and 2.1481 for married or living with someone. Looking at the Levene's test for equality of variances we can see that none of the variances are significantly different ($p=.169, .385, .610>.05$) so we will assume equal variances and use the corresponding information. We can see that the means for all three questions are not significantly different ($p=.882, .555, .964>.05$).

Conclusion:

Because there is no significant difference between people who are married/living together and those who are not we must accept H₀ and reject H_a. Counter to our data and intuition, different packaging options do not seem to influence people based on their relationship status.

Follow-up:

It is possible that in a larger survey, we may find more relevant data as it pertains to interest in different packaging options.

Marketing Mix Analysis:

Price:

As illustrated by our survey data, one of the ways Boston Beer can increase sales of Samuel Adams is by working out a way to lower their prices. Individuals 25-34 and those with some college experience were definitely interested in lower prices. We believe that by lowering prices we will be able to become a choice for young adults who are making their way through college and thereby increasing our sales volumes. If we can get them to try our beer before they become brand loyal to one of the macro-brewers, we could also gain a customer who will be loyal to Samuel Adams. It would be best to see if this works in a test market before attempting to make it a national strategy. We must also consider our bottom line, as well. Because the profit margin for Boston Beer is thinner than others in the industry, an analysis must be done to determine the feasibility of lowering prices and if we can achieve economies of scale by doing so.

Product:

Although our survey data did not indicate that volumes would increase significantly by simply offering our beer in different packages (four-packs, mini-kegs, and cans) we believe that it would be beneficial to offer these different packaging options in a few test markets to actually see how they perform as we did see that individuals 25-34 were significantly more likely to be interested in the different packaging options.

Place:

We feel that offering these different package and pricing options in and around college towns would be our best option. This would allow us to target individuals who have some college experience which have shown a significant likelihood of being interested in lower prices. It would be ideal to increase focus on college areas that also have a large population of 25-34 year olds.

Promotion:

Because Boston Beer prides itself on taste and quality we would need to make sure that our drinkers knew that any other changes (in price, product, and place) would not affect these benchmarks. So, if we were able to successfully lower our prices, it would be beneficial to target those 25-34 by emphasizing our lowered prices without compromising the quality of our beers.

Our survey data also showed that a preference for Lager and Stout style beers predicted how much a person likes Samuel Adams. By focusing advertisements on these styles of beer, we may be able to persuade more of these individuals to try our wide variety of beers.

Survey data has also led us to believe that individuals who are married or living with someone are more likely to like Samuel Adams. Boston Beer would benefit from targeting those individuals by emphasizing the type of bonding that can occur when drinking Samuel Adams. Many of our beers pair very well with different cuisines, much like wine does. Serving our beer with dinner can help stimulate conversation and accentuate the flavor of your cooking. One way to promote our food pairings would be to form a strategic alliance with a national restaurant chain such as Bonefish Grill and others. In doing so, our beers would be paired with different food items on their menu. This would help give everyone, not just couples the idea of pairing beer with their food on a national level.

Works Cited

- (2012, February). Retrieved from Beer Marketer's Insights: www.beerinsights.com
- Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau. (2014). *Tax and Fee Rates*. Retrieved from TTB.gov: http://www.ttb.gov/tax_audit/atftaxes.shtml
- Beer Institute. (2011, August 1). *Brewer's Almanac 2011*. Retrieved from beerinstitute.org.
- Bloomberg LP. (2012, February). Revenue for Anheuser Busch InBev: 2008-2011.
- Bloomberg LP. (2012, February). Revenue for Craft Brew Alliance, Inc.: 2008-2011.
- Bloomberg LP. (2012, February). Revenue for The Boston Beer Co Inc: 2008-2011.
- Boston Beer Co, Inc. (2012, February). Retrieved from [SamuelAdams.com](http://www.samueladams.com): <http://www.samueladams.com/index.aspx>
- Boston Beer Co, Inc. (2012, February). Form 10-K for Fiscal Year 2010. Boston, MA.
- Brewers Association. (2012, February). *Craft Brewing Statistics*. Retrieved from Brewers Association: A Passionate Voice for Craft Brewers: <http://www.brewersassociation.org/pages/business-tools/craft-brewing-statistics/facts>
- Business and Company Resource Center. (2011, February). Craft Brewer Definition Revised.
- Craft Brewery Alliance, Inc. (2012, February). Form 10-K for Fiscal Year 2010.
- Datamonitor. (2012, February). The Boston Beer Company, Inc: Company Profile, 22 Jul 2011. New York City, NY.
- Ewalt, D. (2011). *#1 Samuel Adams Boston Lager*. Retrieved from [Forbes.com](http://www.forbes.com): <http://www.forbes.com/sites/davidewalt/2011/04/08/1-samuel-adams-boston-lager/>
- Ewalt, D. (2011). *Dogfish Head and Boston Beer Meet in SAVOR Flowers*. Retrieved from [Forbes.com](http://www.forbes.com): <http://www.forbes.com/sites/davidewalt/2011/07/27/savor-flowers/>
- FDA. (2013). FDA to Investigate Added Caffeine. Silver Spring, MD. Retrieved from <http://www.fda.gov/forconsumers/consumerupdates/ucm350570.htm>
- Gale Group. (2012). *"Malt Beverages."* *Encyclopedia of American Industries, Online Edition. Reproduced in Business Company and Resource Center*. Retrieved from <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/BCRC>
- Hoovers: A D&B Company. (2012, January 17). Hoover's Company Records- In-depth Records: The Boston Beer Company, Inc.
- Jeff. (2012, February). *Do You Prefer Craft Beer from the Bottle, Can, or Tap? Poll*. Retrieved from Drink Craft Beer: <http://drinkcraftbeer.com/editorial/articles/do-you-prefer-craft-beer-from-the-bottle-can-or-tap-poll.html>
- Kell, J. (2012, January 25). *Boston Beer's Seasonal Strategy Has Historical Roots*. Retrieved from Wall Street Journal: <http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20120126-707018.html>
- Lazich, R. S., & Burton III, V. L. (2012). *Top Beer Makers 2010*. Retrieved from <http://find.galegroup.com/gdl/start.do?prodId=GDL>
- Newberry, J. (2012, January 16). *Ohio Boosts Yuengling to Largest U.S. Brewer*. Retrieved from <http://www.bizjournals.com/dayton/news/2012/01/16/ohio-boosts-yuengling-to-largest-us.html>
- Palmer, K. (2008, December 5). *The Company Behind a Bottle of Sam Adams*. Retrieved from Money.US News: money.usnews.com/money/business-economy/small-business/articles/2008/12/05/the-company-behind-a-bottle-of-sam-adams
- Planes, A. (2011, July 28). *Is Boston Beer Going Flat?* Retrieved from <http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2011/07/28/is-boston-beer-going-flat.aspx>

- Schaefer, S. (2011). *Boston Beer Battered: Sam Adams Brewer Misses Estimates, Cuts Guidance*. Retrieved from Forbes.com: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/steveschaefer/2011/08/02/boston-beer-battered-sam-adams-brewer-misses-estimates-cuts-guidance/>
- Schultz, E. (2011). The New Drinking Session. *Advertising Age*, pp. 1-21.
- Simmons Market Research Bureau. (2012, February). *Simmons One-View Spring 2009 12-month*. New York.
- US Department of Commerce. (2012, February). *Gross Domestic Product*. Retrieved from Bureau of Economic Analysis: <http://www.bea.gov/national/>
- Wilton, B. (2010, December 21). *Boston Beer Co.-Aggressive Growth*. Retrieved from benzinga.com
Retrieved from Business and Company Resource Center.