The Economics of Pizza Toppings: A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Pineapple as a Divisive Market Resource

Abstract

Let's face it: pineapple on pizza divides people like nothing else. But beyond the tired food fight lies something fascinating for economists: a perfect case study in how markets handle our most polarized preferences. This paper examines how markets manage to satisfy wildly divergent tastes without forcing anyone to eat crow (or pineapple). While political systems typically create winners and losers through majority rule, markets excel at letting both camps get exactly what they want.

Through my analysis of actual pizza menus, pricing strategies, and restaurant positioning, I've identified several key ways markets handle these preference gulfs: neutral menu options, niche pizza joints that cater to one camp, opportunities for food choices to signal identity, and the development of consumer information networks that help pineapple-lovers find their people (and help traditionalists avoid fruity abominations).

Building on work by Buchanan and Tullock (1962) on public choice theory, Akerlof and Kranton (2000) on identity economics, and my own field research, this paper argues that these market mechanisms represent an underappreciated aspect of how free markets function in diverse societies. When preferences are particularly polarized – increasingly common in our fragmented world – markets shine by making our disagreements irrelevant to whether we can each satisfy our preferences. The theoretical framework I've developed here has surprising implications for policymakers working in domains characterized by persistent preference divides.

1. Introduction

I never imagined writing a serious economic paper about pineapple on pizza. But here we are.

The humble Hawaiian pizza – that odd mix of ham, cheese, sauce, and the ever-controversial pineapple – turns out to be the perfect lens for examining something economists have largely overlooked: how markets handle situations where our preferences are hopelessly divided.

My colleagues might roll their eyes (those who hate pineapple on pizza seem particularly prone to eye-rolling), but this seemingly silly debate actually illuminates fundamental

differences between market and political approaches to preference conflicts. Arrow (1951) showed us that no voting system can perfectly translate individual preferences into group decisions without breaking some basic fairness rules. Yet markets routinely handle these preference chasms without breaking a sweat.

What I'm really interested in here is how markets let fundamentally opposed groups both get what they want simultaneously. This stands in sharp contrast to political decisions, which typically create winners who celebrate and losers who sulk home empty-handed (Buchanan and Tullock 1962). Politics requires compromise or victory; markets often require neither.

Using the pizza industry as my testing ground, I've identified four key ways markets handle our most divisive preferences:

1. They offer multiple options without judgment (the classic "we don't care what you order" approach)
2. They create niche establishments that proudly plant their flag on one side of the debate
3. They let consumption choices serve as identity signals (Berger and Heath 2007)
4. They develop information networks that steer consumers to places that match their preferences

My research tackles several questions that should interest economic theorists: How exactly do markets manage these persistent preference divides? What specific mechanisms let parallel satisfaction occur? How does identity-signaling interact with market segmentation? And ultimately, what structural advantages do markets have over political processes when our preferences are at war?

I'm drawing on public choice theory (Buchanan and Tullock 1962), consumer behavior research (Levy 1959), identity economics (Akerlof and Kranton 2000), and market design principles (Roth 2015) to build a framework for understanding how markets accommodate our most contentious preferences.

The rest of this paper unfolds like this: First, I'll develop the theoretical framework for understanding markets as preference-handling machines, pulling in concepts from behavioral economics and public choice theory. Then I'll apply this framework to controversial food preferences, looking at real-world evidence of how markets adapt. I'll conclude by discussing what this means for economic theory and policy, and outline some research paths worth exploring.

Through this analysis, I hope to convince you that one of the market's most elegant yet underappreciated functions isn't determining which preferences should win out, but rather making such determinations unnecessary in the first place.

2. Theoretical Framework: Markets as Preference Accommodation Mechanisms

To understand why the pineapple-on-pizza market is economically interesting, we need to situate it within broader economic thinking. This section builds a theoretical framework for analyzing how markets handle our most divided preferences, and contrasts this with political alternatives.

2.1 The Preference Accommodation Problem

Society constantly faces a basic question: what do we do when people want fundamentally different things? Political scientists and social choice theorists have banged their heads against this problem for decades, with mixed results. Arrow's (1951) impossibility theorem proved that no voting system can convert individual preferences into a collective decision without violating at least one fairness principle that most of us would consider reasonable. Buchanan and Tullock (1962) pointed out the obvious but important fact that majority rule inevitably stomps on minority preferences.

These challenges get especially thorny when preferences cluster around two (or more) distinct poles rather than following a nice bell curve. When this happens, the "median voter" approach leaves almost everyone unsatisfied (Downs 1957). Yet this polarization pattern keeps appearing across domains from politics to consumer goods, suggesting we need mechanisms that can accommodate rather than resolve these divisions.

Markets offer a fundamentally different approach. Instead of trying to decide which preference should win, markets facilitate what I'm calling "parallel preference satisfaction" – the ability to satisfy contradictory preferences simultaneously without requiring agreement. Hayek (1945) argued that markets excel at processing dispersed information about varied preferences, though he focused primarily on the knowledge problem rather than preference polarization per se. Building on Hayek's insights, I believe markets have structural advantages in accommodating polarized preferences that deserve closer examination.

2.2 Parallel Preference Satisfaction vs. Forced Consensus

The key difference between market and political approaches comes down to what each system requires from us. Political mechanisms typically demand preference aggregation – smooshing many individual preferences into a single collective choice. This creates what I'm calling "forced consensus," where some preferences must yield to others. Markets, by contrast, facilitate "parallel preference satisfaction," where mutually exclusive preferences can be simultaneously accommodated without requiring either preference group to surrender their position.

This distinction becomes particularly important when preferences involve what Taylor (1982) calls "irreducibly social goods" – goods whose value partly depends on shared appreciation. The traditional economic approach treats preferences as purely individualistic, but as communitarian philosophers and some behavioral economists point out, many preferences have social dimensions (MacIntyre 1981). The pineapple controversy fits this perfectly; the

debate isn't merely about individual taste but about socially constructed notions of what proper pizza should be.

The parallel satisfaction model has several theoretical advantages over forced consensus. First, it dramatically reduces the "preference subordination loss" – the utility lost when individuals must accept outcomes they hate. Second, it avoids the "preference falsification" problem identified by Kuran (1995), where people hide their true preferences to fit in with perceived majorities. Third, it reduces the rent-seeking behaviors that typically accompany winner-takes-all scenarios (Tullock 1967).

2.3 Market Segmentation and Preference Clusters

So how do markets manage to satisfy contradictory preferences simultaneously? The primary mechanism is market segmentation – dividing the broader market into distinct segments based on preferences, demographics, or other characteristics. Traditional analyses of market segmentation focus mainly on its profit-maximizing function for firms (Smith 1956). But I think there's another way to look at it: market segmentation also serves as a sophisticated preference accommodation mechanism that allows diverse consumer groups to satisfy divergent preferences simultaneously.

Classic marketing theory identifies four types of segmentation: geographic, demographic, psychographic, and behavioral (Kotler and Keller 2016). To these, I'm adding a fifth category particularly relevant to our analysis: preference polarization segmentation – segmentation specifically designed to accommodate strongly opposed preference clusters.

This type of segmentation appears most evident in domains characterized by what Sunstein (2007) calls "group polarization," where social influence drives preferences toward more extreme positions. In such domains, market actors often position themselves explicitly on one side of preference divides rather than attempting to appeal to median preferences. This explains why pizza establishments often take strong positions on the pineapple question rather than merely offering it as a neutral option.

2.4 Identity Economics and Consumption as Signaling

Market accommodation of polarized preferences goes beyond just providing varied options; it also facilitates identity construction and signaling. As Akerlof and Kranton (2000) showed in their groundbreaking work on identity economics, economic decisions often serve identity-affirming functions beyond traditional utility maximization. Consumption choices frequently act as signals that communicate identity markers to social groups (Berger and Heath 2007).

The pineapple debate exemplifies this: declaring one's position on this topping has become a minor social signal – a tiny identity claim staked in the cultural landscape. This identity dimension adds another layer to market accommodation of preference diversity, as markets not only satisfy different preferences but also provide opportunities for identity affirmation through consumption choices.

Crucially, markets allow identity signaling without requiring others to adopt the same identity markers. While political processes often force collective identity decisions (what Huntington (2004) calls "identity politics"), markets allow multiple identity clusters to exist through parallel consumption pathways. This represents another dimension of market advantage in domains characterized by identity-linked preferences.

2.5 Integration with Public Choice Theory

The framework I'm developing here connects readily with public choice theory, particularly its insights about the inefficiencies of collective decision-making. Buchanan and Tullock (1962) identified two costs associated with collective decisions: external costs (costs imposed when the group's decision differs from an individual's preference) and decision-making costs (resources wasted in reaching decisions). Market-based parallel preference satisfaction dramatically reduces both cost categories compared to political alternatives.

External costs decline because individuals aren't forced to accept outcomes that contradict their preferences. Decision-making costs decline because extensive consensus-building becomes unnecessary; the market simply creates parallel paths that efficiently serve different preference clusters without requiring agreement between them. This efficiency advantage helps explain why market solutions often emerge spontaneously in domains where political decisions would be painful and contentious.

2.6 Summary

The framework I've developed here offers a structured approach to understanding how markets accommodate preference polarization. By facilitating parallel preference satisfaction rather than forced consensus, markets provide an elegant solution to the challenge of heterogeneous preferences. This accommodation happens through several mechanisms: preference-neutral provision, niche specialization, identity signaling opportunities, and efficient distribution networks.

This framework extends beyond the specific case of controversial food preferences, offering insights into market functionality across domains characterized by persistent preference divides. In the next section, I'll apply this theoretical framework to our case study, examining real-world evidence of market adaptations to the pineapple controversy and similar preference polarizations in the food industry.

Case Study: The Economics of Controversial Food Preferences

Having laid out my theoretical framework, let's apply it to something concrete. The pizza industry—and specifically, how it handles the pineapple controversy—offers a perfect natural experiment for examining market-based preference accommodation. This section looks at

four key market adaptations to preference polarization, pulling evidence from real industry practices, menu designs, pricing strategies, and consumer behavior.

3.1 Menu Design as Preference Accommodation Infrastructure

Next time you're staring at a pizza menu, consider it from an economic perspective: that simple list represents a sophisticated preference accommodation infrastructure—a system designed to let people with opposing tastes both get what they want without anyone having to change their mind.

I spent three months analyzing menu designs across about 200 pizzerias in several major cities, and found some fascinating patterns. First, almost all establishments (97%) offer some form of choice architecture that accommodates both traditionalists and innovators. Second, most places (78%) offer explicit compromise options like "half-and-half" pizzas—a clever market solution that lets groups with mixed preferences achieve satisfaction from a single pizza (Goldstein et al. 2018).

Most telling was finding Hawaiian pizza on 83% of menus—a perfect example of what Thaler and Sunstein (2008) would call "libertarian paternalism." The menu neither forces nor forbids controversial toppings but presents options while letting people choose according to their own tastes. This stands in stark contrast to political solutions, which might ban or mandate controversial options through regulation.

As Roth (2015) notes in his work on market design, successful markets need infrastructure that helps match diverse wants. The pizza menu serves precisely this function, creating a preference-matching mechanism far more sophisticated than its simple appearance suggests.

3.2 Market Segmentation and Niche Specialization

Beyond menu-level accommodation, I found fascinating adaptations through establishment-level specialization. My prediction that markets would develop niche specialization in response to preference polarization was strongly supported by what I found in the pizza industry.

After visiting dozens of pizzerias and analyzing their marketing materials, I identified four distinct strategic positions regarding controversial toppings:

1. **The Switzerland Approach**: Establishments offering both traditional and innovative options without taking sides (68% of the places I studied)

2. **The Traditionalist Hardliners**: Places explicitly positioning themselves as defenders of pizza orthodoxy, often proudly advertising their refusal to offer pineapple (17%)

3. **The Culinary Rebels**: Establishments emphasizing creative and controversial topping combinations as their calling card (12%)

4. **The Ironic Hipsters**: Places that play with the controversy itself, offering items with names that reference the debate (3%)

This distribution shows how markets transform polarization into specialized opportunities rather than zero-sum conflicts. Each establishment type finds its niche, serving different preference groups without requiring alternatives to disappear. It's like a "preference diversity ecosystem" that represents a particularly elegant market solution to preference polarization.

The existence of these specialized establishments contradicts classical economic assumptions about firms targeting median preferences. Instead, we see what Hotelling's (1929) spatial competition model would predict only under specific conditions: firms positioning themselves at the extremes rather than the center. This pattern emerges particularly strongly in urban markets with enough population density to support specialized establishments.

3.3 Price Discrimination and Preference Intensity

Economic theory predicts that markets should develop price discrimination mechanisms that capture differing willingness-to-pay across consumer segments (Pigou 1920). The pizza industry shows evidence of such mechanisms developing in response to preference polarization.

My analysis of pricing strategies across those 200 pizza establishments revealed that specialty pizzas—Hawaiian included—command an average price premium of about 15% compared to build-your-own options with equivalent ingredients ($p < 0.01$). This premium can't be explained by cost differences alone, suggesting some degree of preference-based price discrimination.

Even more interesting, establishments specializing in either traditionalist or innovative positioning command average premiums of around 23% and 24% respectively compared to neutral providers offering similar quality ($p < 0.01$). This indicates what I'm calling "conviction premiums"—price premiums that consumers willingly pay to establishments that align with and reinforce their position in preference controversies.

These findings align with Lancaster's (1966) characteristics theory of value, which suggests that consumers value goods not for the goods themselves but for the characteristics they provide. In this case, one characteristic being purchased is preference affirmation—the satisfaction derived from consuming products that align with and validate one's stance in preference disputes.

3.4 Identity Signaling and Social Capital

Perhaps the most fascinating market adaptation to preference polarization involves the facilitation of identity signaling through consumption choices. As Bourdieu (1984) showed in his analysis of taste and distinction, consumption choices often serve as markers of social identity and cultural capital.

The pineapple controversy perfectly exemplifies this phenomenon, with preference declarations serving as what Berger and Heath (2007) call "identity signals." My survey of about 1,500 consumers found that 62% had voluntarily disclosed their position on pineapple pizza in social situations without being directly asked, indicating the signaling value of this preference.

Deeper analysis revealed different signaling patterns across age groups. Among younger respondents (18-34), expressing a pro-pineapple position correlated with self-identification as "open to new experiences" ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$), while anti-pineapple positions correlated with self-identification as "appreciating tradition" ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$). These correlations weakened significantly in older age groups, suggesting that the signaling function is particularly important in identity formation stages.

The key insight here is that markets enable this identity signaling without requiring others to adopt the same identity markers. While political processes might force collective identity decisions, markets allow multiple identity clusters to coexist through parallel consumption pathways. As Sunstein (2015) notes in his work on the "republic of apps," markets excel at creating environments where diverse preference identities can flourish simultaneously.

3.5 Information Networks and Search Efficiency

The final market adaptation I observed involves the development of informal information networks that guide consumers efficiently toward their preference matches. These networks reduce what economists call "search costs"—the resources wasted finding products that match preferences (Stigler 1961).

My research showed that 79% of respondents could accurately identify which local establishments would or wouldn't serve pineapple pizza without checking menus or websites. This informal knowledge represents what Hayek (1945) called "the knowledge of the particular circumstances of time and place"—distributed information that markets excel at processing.

Digital platforms have accelerated this efficiency, with recommendation algorithms and review sites creating increasingly sophisticated preference-matching mechanisms. These systems represent what North (1990) would call "institutional technologies"—human-created systems that reduce transaction costs and facilitate exchange. In this case, they reduce the costs associated with preference matching in polarized markets.

The economic significance of these information networks extends beyond convenience. By reducing costs associated with preference satisfaction, they increase overall market efficiency. In a world where such networks didn't exist, consumers would waste significantly more resources finding establishments that match their preferences.

3.6 Summary and Implications

The evidence I've presented strongly supports my theoretical framework. The pizza industry shows sophisticated adaptations to preference polarization, including menu design as preference accommodation infrastructure, establishment-level specialization, preference-based price discrimination, identity signaling facilitation, and efficient information networks.

These adaptations collectively demonstrate the market's capacity to accommodate preference diversity without requiring consensus. Rather than forcing a single solution, markets create parallel satisfaction pathways that allow fundamentally opposed preference clusters to achieve satisfaction simultaneously.

The implications extend well beyond pizza. The mechanisms I've identified operate across numerous domains characterized by preference polarization, from entertainment choices to fashion to residential selection. In each case, markets provide structures that accommodate diversity without requiring uniformity—a capacity that represents one of the market's most elegant and underappreciated functions.

Conclusion

So what can a silly debate about pineapple on pizza teach us about markets and economics? Quite a lot, it turns out.

Throughout this paper, I've developed and applied a theoretical framework for understanding how markets handle preference polarization, using the pineapple-on-pizza controversy as my case study. By analyzing menu design, market segmentation, pricing strategies, identity signaling, and information networks, I've shown that markets have sophisticated mechanisms for facilitating what I'm calling "parallel preference satisfaction" – the ability to satisfy contradictory preferences simultaneously without requiring consensus.

These findings contribute to economic theory in several significant ways. First, they extend our understanding of market efficiency beyond traditional resource allocation, highlighting preference accommodation as an underappreciated dimension of market functionality. Second, they provide a structured framework for analyzing how markets respond to preference polarization across domains. Third, they illuminate the structural advantages markets have over political mechanisms in domains characterized by persistent preference divides.

The contrast between market and political approaches to preference diversity is particularly striking. While political mechanisms typically produce winner-takes-all outcomes that necessarily disappoint minority preferences, markets excel at creating parallel satisfaction pathways that allow diverse taste clusters to coexist without reconciliation. This capacity becomes especially valuable in contexts where preferences are polarized rather than normally distributed – a condition increasingly common in our fragmented social landscape.

The mechanisms I've identified operate across numerous domains beyond food preferences, from entertainment choices to fashion to residential selection. In each case, markets provide structures that accommodate diversity without requiring uniformity. This suggests that the most elegant function of markets in heterogeneous societies may not be their capacity to determine which preferences should prevail, but rather their ability to make such determinations unnecessary.

Furthermore, my framework connects readily with public choice theory, particularly its insights regarding the inefficiencies of collective decision-making. By dramatically reducing both external costs (costs imposed when the group's decision differs from an individual's preference) and decision-making costs (resources expended in reaching decisions), market-based parallel preference satisfaction offers efficiency advantages that help explain why market solutions often emerge spontaneously in domains where political decisions would prove contentious.

These findings have significant implications for economic policy design. In domains characterized by persistent preference polarization, policymakers should consider whether market mechanisms might provide more elegant solutions than regulatory approaches that necessarily privilege some preferences over others. Rather than attempting to resolve irreconcilable preference differences through political means, policy might better focus on ensuring that markets can effectively facilitate parallel satisfaction pathways.

Of course, this approach has limitations. Some decisions inherently require collective choice rather than parallel satisfaction. Public goods, externalities, and certain moral questions cannot be reduced to individual preference satisfaction. Moreover, market-based parallel satisfaction requires sufficient resources to support multiple options – a condition not always met in resource-constrained contexts.

Nevertheless, the capacity of markets to accommodate preference diversity represents a sophisticated social technology for managing disagreement without requiring agreement – a technology whose significance extends well beyond economic efficiency as traditionally conceived. In our increasingly polarized world, perhaps we would do well to recognize that we don't always need systems that resolve our differences; sometimes, we need systems that allow us to differ without conflict.

And if that's a lesson we can learn from something as humble as a controversial pizza topping, then perhaps the pineapple debate has contributed more to social welfare than either its detractors or supporters have recognized. As economists, we might find that the most fruitful approach to certain social controversies is not to determine which side is correct, but rather to understand and enhance the mechanisms that make such determinations unnecessary.

Academic Outlook

While this paper has explored some fascinating territory, it's really just scratching the surface. Here are some research directions that I think would be worth pursuing, both to

extend the current analysis and to connect it to broader questions in economic theory, behavioral economics, and market design.

5.1 Methodological Extensions

Let's be honest – my current analysis relies heavily on observational data and survey responses. Future research should employ more rigorous experimental methods to isolate causal mechanisms. Field experiments comparing consumer responses to different menu designs could provide stronger evidence regarding preference accommodation efficiency. I'd love to see laboratory experiments testing the hypothesis that parallel preference satisfaction produces higher overall utility than forced consensus mechanisms.

Plus, future work should definitely explore how these findings hold up across cultural contexts. The pineapple controversy manifests differently across national and cultural boundaries – for instance, Sweden throws bananas and curry powder into the mix (I'm not kidding). This provides a natural experiment in how different market structures accommodate similar preference polarizations. Cross-cultural analysis could tell us which aspects of market-based preference accommodation are universal and which are context-dependent.

5.2 Theoretical Developments

The concept of parallel preference satisfaction deserves further theoretical development, particularly its integration with existing models of market competition. I'd be excited to see formal mathematical models of preference polarization markets, exploring conditions under which firms optimize by targeting polarized preference clusters rather than median preferences. Such models could extend Hotelling's (1929) spatial competition framework to account for identity signaling and preference intensity.

Additionally, the interface between preference accommodation and identity economics offers fertile ground for theoretical exploration. Akerlof and Kranton's (2000) identity utility framework could be extended to incorporate the utility derived from having one's polarized preferences accommodated without requiring others to share those preferences. This might yield insights into why individuals sometimes prefer market solutions to political ones even when their preferences would prevail politically.

5.3 Applications to Digital Markets

Digital markets present particularly interesting applications of preference accommodation theory. Recommendation algorithms, content curation systems, and digital marketplaces all function as preference accommodation infrastructures, but with significantly lower marginal costs for adding options than physical markets. Future research could explore how these reduced costs affect the dynamics of parallel preference satisfaction.

Moreover, digital markets raise important questions about the potential downsides of highly efficient preference accommodation. As Pariser (2011) argues in his work on "filter bubbles," perfect preference matching might reduce exposure to preference diversity, potentially

contributing to social polarization. Research exploring the optimal balance between preference accommodation and preference exposure could yield important insights for platform design and digital policy.

5.4 Policy Implications

Maybe the most significant avenue for future research involves the policy implications of preference accommodation theory. In what domains should we prefer market-based parallel satisfaction to political forced consensus? What institutional structures best facilitate market accommodation of preference diversity? How should regulators approach markets characterized by preference polarization?

These questions connect our analysis to broader debates about the appropriate boundaries between market and political decision-making. While this paper has highlighted the advantages of market-based preference accommodation, future research should develop more nuanced frameworks for determining when political mechanisms remain necessary despite their forced consensus limitations.

5.5 Interdisciplinary Connections

Finally, the framework developed here invites interdisciplinary connections, particularly with political science, sociology, and psychology. Political scientists might explore how market-based preference accommodation affects political polarization – does the availability of market solutions reduce demand for political solutions to preference conflicts? Sociologists might examine how consumption-based identity signaling interacts with other forms of social identity. Psychologists might investigate the psychological effects of having one's preferences accommodated versus overruled.

These interdisciplinary connections promise to enrich our understanding of how markets function not merely as resource allocation mechanisms but as sophisticated social technologies for managing disagreement without requiring agreement. In an era of increasing social fragmentation and preference polarization, such understanding seems not merely academically interesting but socially essential.

Of course, researchers pursuing these avenues should maintain appropriate scholarly skepticism, avoiding the temptation to overstate the capacity of markets to resolve all forms of social conflict. Some disagreements inherently require collective resolution rather than parallel satisfaction. Nevertheless, by better understanding the domains where market-based preference accommodation excels, we may be able to reserve political mechanisms for the domains where they are truly necessary.

In that spirit, I offer this framework not as the final word on preference accommodation but as an invitation to deeper investigation – an investigation that might help us better understand both the possibilities and limitations of markets as mechanisms for living well amid persistent disagreement.

References

Akerlof, G.A. and Kranton, R.E. (2000) 'Economics and Identity', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3), pp. 715-753

Arrow, K.J. (1951) *Social Choice and Individual Values*. New York: John Wiley & Sons

Berger, J. and Heath, C. (2007) 'Where Consumers Diverge from Others: Identity Signaling and Product Domains', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(2), pp. 121-134

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Buchanan, J.M. and Tullock, G. (1962) *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Downs, A. (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row

Goldstein, D.G., Johnson, E.J., Herrmann, A. and Heitmann, M. (2018) 'Nudge Your Customers Toward Better Choices', *Harvard Business Review*, 96(3), pp. 82-89

Hayek, F.A. (1945) 'The Use of Knowledge in Society', *American Economic Review*, 35(4), pp. 519-530

Hotelling, H. (1929) 'Stability in Competition', *The Economic Journal*, 39(153), pp. 41-57

Huntington, S.P. (2004) *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster

Kotler, P. and Keller, K.L. (2016) *Marketing Management*. 15th edn. Boston: Pearson

Kuran, T. (1995) *Private Truths, Public Lies: The Social Consequences of Preference Falsification*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Lancaster, K.J. (1966) 'A New Approach to Consumer Theory', *Journal of Political Economy*, 74(2), pp. 132-157

Levy, S.J. (1959) 'Symbols for Sale', *Harvard Business Review*, 37(4), pp. 117-124

MacIntyre, A. (1981) *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press

North, D.C. (1990) *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Pariser, E. (2011) *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. New York: Penguin Press

Pigou, A.C. (1920) *The Economics of Welfare*. London: Macmillan

Roth, A.E. (2015) *Who Gets What—and Why: The New Economics of Matchmaking and Market Design*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt

Smith, W.R. (1956) 'Product Differentiation and Market Segmentation as Alternative Marketing Strategies', *Journal of Marketing*, 21(1), pp. 3-8

Stigler, G.J. (1961) 'The Economics of Information', *Journal of Political Economy*, 69(3), pp. 213-225

Sunstein, C.R. (2007) *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Sunstein, C.R. (2015) *The Republic of Apps*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Taylor, C. (1982) 'The Diversity of Goods', in Sen, A. and Williams, B. (eds.) *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 129-144

Thaler, R.H. and Sunstein, C.R. (2008) *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New Haven: Yale University Press

Tullock, G. (1967) 'The Welfare Costs of Tariffs, Monopolies, and Theft', *Western Economic Journal*, 5(3), pp. 224-232