I thought everything was relative

Let me start out by saying that I love Uncommon Grounds, but their coffee sizing methods just don't make sense.

Is it not logical to call your smallest size, oh, I don't know...SMALL? And say, perhaps, you had three sizes. What would you call them? I think the industry standard would be "small", "medium", and "large". Unfortunately, this is not the case at Uncommon Grounds. I can forgive the "single", "double", and "triple" labels. They at least make sense; unlike Starbucks with their "venti" and WTF. But if you ask for a coffee by actual size, you'll quickly find that their scale is skewed to the right: Their smallest coffee is a medium. Why are these sizes not relative?

Sure, there are times when a size should be absolute, like clothing. If I wear an extra-large, I want to be able to buy any extra-large and know it will fit. If the same methodology were to apply to UG's coffee, then they should offer a small as well.

Originally posted on Tuesday, 2005-04-12 at 10:10:03.

Revision #1
Created 2022-02-01 17:51:39 AST by Steve Dinn
Updated 2022-02-01 17:51:39 AST by Steve Dinn