Crafting a Wine Business Case Study and Its Teaching Note: Guidance for Research and Publication

This paper will attempt to open a dialogue about the elements that constitute an outstanding wine business case study and, if used for teaching purposes, an instructor’s manual. The ability to understand, synthesize, evaluate, and also create cases is becoming an increasingly important career-building skill for graduates of higher education programs across all disciplines. Case studies about wine businesses can help achieve mastery of program learning outcomes and begin to close the loop (Alexander, 2011). Numerous wine business program graduates have reported that adding evidence of their ability to create, review, or analyze cases to their “job search portfolios” had given them “an edge over other candidates” for a position.

* * *

STEP 1—PLANNING

The initial step in planning a wine business case study (“case”) involves deciding its purpose or ultimate use. A case can be intended for some research purpose i.e., to build or refute theory via comparative case analyses (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007; Sigglekow, 2007; Yin, 1994). Alternatively, a case can be developed for teaching purposes, i.e., to illustrate or derive theory in a classroom setting that involves a dialectical discussion to identify problems or challenges facing an organization and then generate and choose among solutions. In some instances, authors can craft a case that will satisfy both objectives, i.e. one might compare multiple teaching cases to build theory (cf. Gilinsky et al. 2008, 2010; Lawrence, 2010).

Aside from the differentiation between a case developed with a research purpose in mind and a case developed with the illustration of a theory in mind, there are also decision cases as compared to evaluative (sometimes called “discussion cases”). A decision case allows the student to internalize a real decision that an actor in the case must make and develop and support a solution for that decision. An evaluative case, on the other hand, presents information about a particular situation or event that has occurred in the past in an organization and allows the discussants to reflect upon the actions taken to learn lessons from the decisions made. This type of case can also be used to develop theory. One disadvantage of discussion or evaluative cases is
that a number of journals only publish cases that are decision focused. Exhibit 1 is a representative list of case journals.

Exhibit 1
A Representative List of Peer-Reviewed Case Journals

| Name of Journal                     | Sponsor                                      | Accepts Only Decision Cases | Accepts Both Decision & Discussion Cases | Primary Focus                                      |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Wine Business Case Research Journal | Sonoma State University Wine Business Institute | X                            |                                           | Cases dealing with the wine industry               |
| Case Research Journal               | North American Case Research Assoc.          | X                            |                                           | All business disciplines                           |
| The Case Journal                    | The Case Association                         |                              | X                                        | All business disciplines                           |
| The Journal of Applied Case Research| Southwest Case Research Association         |                              | X                                        | All business disciplines                           |
| The Journal of Finance Case Research| Institute of Finance Case Research           |                              | X                                        | Finance and Economics                              |
| The Journal of Ethics & Entrepreneurship | The Center for Ethics & Entrepreneurship, Gardner-Webb University | X |                                           | The intersection of ethics & entrepreneurship        |
| The Journal of Business Ethics Education | Neilson Journal Publishing                   | X                            |                                           | Ethics                                             |

Source: Authors of this paper.

STEP 2—SELECTING A TOPIC

Once you have decided upon the ultimate use of your case, put together a list of three-to-five major learning objectives and relevant interview questions tied to those objectives. It also makes good sense to tie your primary (field) and secondary (library or electronic database) research objectives to your program or school’s learning objectives. See Exhibit 2 for five sample topics: (1) Goals, (2) Business model, (3) Situational environment, (4) Stakeholders, and (5) Assumptions and key metrics.
Exhibit 2
Sample Topics for a Wine Business Case

| Under- (or Over-) Achievement of Goals | Selection or Evolution of Business Model | Changes in Situational Environment | Conflicts among Stakeholders and/or Their Values | Changes in Assumptions and Metrics |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Customer acquisition                  | Family v. cooperative v. corporate ownership | PESTEL analysis:                  | Founders / team                                | Consumer behavior                  |
| Market share                          | Management                              | P - Political E - Economic S - Social T - Technology E - Environment L - Legal | Family (or families)                      | Future demand                        |
| Quality control                       | Processes                               | SWOT analysis:                    | Succession planning                           | Revenue growth                      |
| Brand image/positioning               | Sourcing                                | (Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats) | Stockholders/Investors Creditors              | Pricing                              |
| ROI                                   | Generic strategy (low cost v. differentiation, broad v. mass markets) | VRIN analysis:                    | Customers                                      | Costs & margins                      |
| Capacity                               | Production (In-house v. outsourced)     | (Valued, Rare, Inimitable, Non-substitutable resources & capabilities, etc.) | Suppliers                                      | Industry forces                      |
| Capital accumulation                  | Distribution channel(s)                 |                                   | Government                                      | Resources & capabilities            |
| Financial health                      | IT systems, etc.                        |                                   | Community                                       | Production output & efficiency      |
| Sustainability                        |                                        |                                   | Competitors                                     | Customer acquisition costs          |
| Managed growth, etc.                  |                                        |                                   | Environment (natural world), etc.              | Customer attrition rates            |
|                                       |                                        |                                   | Ethics                                          | Staff turnover                       |
|                                       |                                        |                                   | Corporate Social Responsibility                | Competition from imports            |
|                                       |                                        |                                   | Triple Bottom-Line                             | Exports as % of sales, etc.         |

Source: Authors of this paper.

**Under- (or over-) achievement of goals.** This is generally a good topic to get your case research underway, and to get at this issue, you might ask your case client (wine producer or support organization such as a bank, cooperage, tourism provider, distributor, etc.) about some of the major changes it has undergone over the years since that business was founded. Much in the wine industry has changed since most participants in that industry were born! Your case client’s evolution over time may also illustrate the change from a family managed to a professionally managed business, or on a more macro level, the maturation of the wine industry sector itself, all reflective of shifting emphases over time. Your case could also show how your case client’s top management team’s strategies and leadership styles have changed to match changing situations over time (Churchill and Lewis, 1989; Daily and Dollinger, 1994; Greiner, 1972). **Exhibit 3** illustrates how one winery, Beringer Wine Estates, evolved in the years since 1876, when it was founded by German immigrants in Napa, California.
Exhibit 3
Evolution of Beringer Wine Estates, 1875–present

| Dates                | Ownership                  | Situation                                                                 | Style                        | Strategy                      |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1876 (founding) - 1970 | Beringer family            | Agrarian nation; major wave of European immigrants; post-Industrial revolution | Family business, small business, agrarian | Prospector Early market entry in US (St. Helena, CA); local/regional scope |
| 1970 – 1986 (Wine World Estates) | Conglomerate-Nestlé         | Growth in jug wine segments                                                | Professional, economists & marketers | Reactor Subsidiary of MNC; leverage into national mass-market distribution |
| 1996-1997            | Private (via LBO)           | Double-digit growth in premium wine segments; increased acceptance of wineries in public equities markets | Entrepreneurial               | Prospector Re-invent company in premium wine segments |
| 1997-2000            | Public (via IPO)            | Fragmented market; entry of Australian wineries into global markets        | Professional; opportunistic   | Analyzer Growth via acquisition and diversification of low-end segments |
| 2000- present        | Conglomerate – Foster’s Group/Treasury Wine Estates (TWE) | Constant growth in premium segment; consolidation and maturity of trade channels; merger with Mildara Blass; spin-off from Fosters’ Group into TWE | Professional, economists & marketers | Defender Operating unit of MNC; leverage into global mass-market distribution |

Source: Authors of this paper.

Selection or evolution of a business model. Business models and how they have been adopted specifically in the wine industry are ripe topics for case authors. Business models often involve supply chain choices, degree of integration, and selection of distribution channel(s). For example, authors may want to illustrate the advantages and disadvantages of various business models, i.e., wineries are either partially integrated, fully integrated, or “virtual.” Exhibit 4 lists some of the pros and cons of the virtual and fully integrated winery business models.

Exhibit 4
Pros and Cons of Winery Integration Options

| Virtual Winery | Pros: | Cons: |
|---------------|-------|-------|
|               | Lower capital requirements | No winery for customers to visit |
|               | More flexibility to adjust to trends | Long-term assets are mostly intangible |
|               | Shorter delay before earning revenue | More difficult to build a “story” to tell |
|               | Lower operating risk due to decreased fixed costs | Lower contribution margin on incremental sales |
## Bricks & Mortar Winery

| Pros:                                                                 | Cons:                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Winery has a sense of place                                           | Upfront costs are very high                                          |
| Potential for appreciation of asset value, especially land and        | Delay from incurring first costs to earning revenue, especially     |
| buildings                                                            | with vineyards                                                       |
| Customer visits may build brand loyalty                               | Must project consumer tastes far in future                          |
| Higher contribution margin on incremental sales                       | Higher operating risk due to increased fixed costs.                  |

**Source:** Authors of this paper.

### Changes in the situational environment

Wine businesses might well be characterized, to paraphrase former Sony CEO Akio Morita (1986), “[as] inheritors of a rich agrarian cultural tradition and philosophy, which are influenced by nature and change of the seasons,” i.e., by analog thinking and slow motion. While the wine industry has heretofore experienced slow evolution (Cooper, 2007), recently, some players have pursued innovative strategies. Some innovations that may become interesting case topics include: sustainable farming techniques such as organic and biodynamic agriculture; specific varietal (vs. blended) products; packaging other than glass bottles and closures other than corks; market re-segmentation from two major price tiers to multiple tiers and into emerging demographic or lifestyle categories such as “GenX” or the “Millennials;” new marketing approaches such as “lifestyle” brand names, wine clubs, fair trade and organic product labeling, use of the Internet to promote information and, in some instances, direct sales; and, in selected cases, the emergence of new organization structures i.e., ‘virtual’ wineries. Yet most players in the wine industry have not yet adopted these innovations, either in total or in part, nor do they have plans to do so in the near future (Jordan, Zidda, and Lockshin, 2007).

Authors may want to focus on brand development in a domestic or a global context. A product-driven company is one that aims to make the best product possible and differentiates itself on the basis of quality. In striving for quality, the raw materials selected are critical. For a winery, this would be the grapes, barrels, etc. Some other descriptors of a product-driven company could include: high-cost production, price-resistant products, recognized origins or terroir, production limited by quality, quality/brand relationship, and/or lower sales and marketing costs than rivals. Use of the “Hierarchy of Differentiation” (Huneeus, 2001) is key to product-driven wineries. Huneeus (2001, p. 101-102) indicates that, in order to sustain product differentiation, a winery must build a big brand image. There is a hierarchy that wineries can evolve through, as the product class gets smaller. Each further classification adds to a wine producer’s ability to differentiate. An outline of this hierarchy appears in Exhibit 5.
However, since many students and practitioners lack multinational business experience, let alone managerial experience growing ventures in a diversified context, some case authors may want to illustrate the benefits and limits of operating in a global context. One way to do so is to consider strategic issues on the country level, corporate level, and business level, as follows:

1) To illustrate country-level strategy, design your case to examine the dynamics of competition among the “new-world” wine producers in Australia and California as well as other wine-producing countries (Porter, 1990).

2) To illustrate corporate-level strategy, design your case to create a dialogue over the benefits and limits of international, multi-domestic, global, and transnational strategies (Harrison et al. 2001).

3) To illustrate business-level strategy, design your case to spark a debate over whether Winery X should focus on internal (organic) growth of its brands v. external growth via acquisitions. Illustrate some of the challenges associated with creating a “center of excellence,” i.e., achieving synergies among globally diversified product lines such as branded products, hospitality, and events (Palich and Gomez-Mejia, 1999).

The appropriateness of those strategies varies given the extent of pressures for cost reductions and local responsiveness (Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1989). International and global strategies tend to be least appropriate in markets where local responsiveness to consumer tastes is important (e.g. in consumer food and beverage products industries, with the possible exception of sodas, beer, and spirits). At the same time, in the wine industry, competitive conditions are so intense that to survive, companies must essentially do all they can to respond to pressures for cost reductions and local responsiveness. Exhibit 6 illustrates some of the advantages and disadvantages of different strategies for competing globally and applies those to Winery X’s situation. Yet changing a company’s business model to build an organization capable of supporting a transnational strategy is a complex and challenging task: implementation problems associated with creating the requisite organizational structure and control systems have been well documented (Palich and Gomez-Mejia, 1999).
## Exhibit 6
Global Strategic Alternatives for A Wine Business

| Strategy    | Advantages                                                                 | Disadvantages                                                                 | Winery X's Strategy                                                   |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| International | Transfer of distinctive competencies to foreign markets                     | Lack of local responsiveness                                                  | Does not respond to need for cost reductions                          |
|             |                                                                             | Inability to realize location economies                                      | Does not respond to pressures for local responsiveness in wine segment|
|             |                                                                             | Failure to exploit experience-curve effects                                  |                                                                       |
| Multi-domestic | Ability to customize product offerings and marketing in accordance with local responsiveness | Inability to realize location economies                                      | Meets need for localization in wine segment but does not address need for cost reductions |
|             |                                                                             | Failure to exploit experience-curve effects                                  |                                                                       |
|             |                                                                             | Failure to transfer distinctive competencies to foreign markets              |                                                                       |
| Global      | Ability to exploit experience-curve effects                                  | Lack of local responsiveness                                                  | Makes sense for beer segment but not (yet) for wine segment          |
|             | Ability to realize location economies                                        |                                                                             | May be driven by pressures for cost reductions                       |
| Transnational | Ability to exploit experience-curve effects                                  | Difficulties in implementation because of organizational problems           | Logical – given pressures for cost reductions and local responsiveness|
|             | Ability to exploit location economies, customize product offerings and marketing to afford local responsiveness, and reap benefits of local learning |                                                                             |                                                                       |

Sources: Adapted from Bartlett & Ghoshal (1989), Hill & Jones (2004).

**Conflicts (or cohesion) among key stakeholders.** There are multiple stakeholders involved in a winery supply chain, from suppliers to creditors to owners to staff, etc. Case authors should strongly consider presenting a 360-degree view of an organization using either multiple voices or multiple viewpoints to show how conflict is managed and consensus is gained. Most wineries are small, family-owned businesses, and members of families can often come into conflict over challenges such as the pace of growth, innovation, and succession planning. For all wine businesses, regardless of management or ownership, there may be disagreements with (or among) various actors, including staff, communities, creditors, and so forth. See Exhibit 7 for examples of stakeholder expectations and needs.
**Exhibit 7**

**Identifying and Managing Stakeholders’ Expectations**

| Stakeholder     | Stakeholder’s Expectations                                                                 | If unmet?                                      |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Employees       | Let’s work together<br>We want stable employment and fair compensation<br>We want to be treated fairly | We can work elsewhere…                        |
| Customers       | We want you to meet our needs for quality and safety<br>We’ll both receive value          | We can buy elsewhere…                         |
| Suppliers       | We want to be paid on time<br>We want information and repeat business<br>Let’s form an alliance | We can sell elsewhere…                        |
| Creditors       | We want principal and interest to be paid back on time                                   | We can seize your assets…                     |
| Stockholders/   | We want you to protect and grow our investment<br>We want you to become the industry leader | We can withdraw support…                      |
| investors       |                                                                                          |                                               |
| Environment     | Obey the rules<br>Environment comes first                                                | Mother Nature bats last…                     |
| Competitors     | We are all in this together<br>We can build an industry                                 | We will overtake you…                        |
| Government      | We want you to comply with regulations                                                    | We can close your operation…                 |
| Community       | You have a responsibility                                                                 | “Not in my backyard”                          |

*Source: adapted from Clarkson (1995)*

*Changes in assumptions or key metrics.* One possible objective of a wine business case is to facilitate exposition of a hypothetical winery’s — Napa Winery X’s — portfolio options. **Exhibit 8** compares characteristics of its varietal wines.
Exhibit 8
Analysis of Napa Winery X’s Varietal Wine Portfolio

| Portfolio varietal (color) | Pros                                                                 | Cons                                                                                       |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Cabernet Sauvignon (red)** | Highest volume super-premium/luxury wine                             | Long cycle from planting to sale & high inventory carrying costs                           |
|                            | Higher growth in demand for red wines                                | Unknown if demand has peaked for this varietal                                             |
|                            | Higher margins than all others except red blends                     |                                            |                                        |
|                            | Cult status of high-end Napa appellation wines                       |                                            |                                        |
| **Chardonnay (white)**     | Highest volume among all wine segments                               | Low gross margin                                                                          |
|                            | Status of Russian River appellation wines                            | Flat demand                                                                               |
|                            |                                                                         | Not currently sourced in Napa                                                              |
| **Meritage (and other red blends)** | Expensive - demand limited to connoisseurs and core drinkers | Unknown future demand                                                                     |
|                            | Highest margin wine                                                  | Requires Association membership to be called “Meritage”                                    |
| **Sauvignon Blanc (white)** | Shortest cycle time to generate cash flow                            | Flat to modest growth in demand                                                            |
|                            | Grapes less expensive                                                | Low market share                                                                           |
|                            | Demand currently exceeds supply                                      |                                            |                                        |
| **Zinfandel (red)**        | Cult status & support from ZAP                                        | Low market share                                                                          |
|                            | Low priced relative to other portfolio wines                          | Rising prices for Napa grapes                                                              |
|                            | High past growth rates                                               | Demand may have already peaked                                                            |
|                            | Demand currently exceeds supply                                      |                                            |                                        |
| **Petite Sirah (red)**     | Cult status & support from P.S. I Love You                           | Low market share                                                                          |
|                            | Low priced relative to other portfolio wines                          | Lowest gross margin of all varietal wines                                                  |
|                            | Fastest growing segment                                              | Rising prices for Napa grapes                                                              |
|                            | Demand currently exceeds supply                                      | Unknown future demand                                                                     |

Source: Authors of this paper.

STEP 3—WRITING YOUR CASE AND TEACHING NOTE

Ok, so now that you have your topic and objectives in mind, it is time to get started. Exhibit 9 is intended to guide authors who are ready to embark on a wine business case project.
Exhibit 9
What Authors Need To Do To Create A Written (or Digital) Case

Begin with your learning objectives
- Lay out your instructor’s manual before you begin – 3-5 learning objectives, linkages to applicable theory, and questions for discussion
- Show how the learning objectives (LOs) match up with your program’s LOs and/or course LOs
- List the salient evidence and data that need to be collected (and possible sources of those) in order to meet the above objectives

Outline your primary and secondary research strategies in advance
- Obtain written permissions to conduct field research
- Decide whether or not you will need to impose organizational, character, and/or data disguises
- Plan for both structured and un-structured interviews
- Cite source materials and acknowledgements
- Create a contingency plan in case the case client or protagonist suddenly becomes unavailable or is unwilling to proceed through a possibly lengthy testing and review process.

Make decisions about content before you create it
- Decide whether or not you really need a completely written (or digital) case, a hybrid case incorporating both a written and a digital case, or just an audio-visual supplement to a written narrative
- Decide how you plan to ensure access to content for students with disabilities
- Decide if you want your case to be accessible on mobile devices, which could require:
  o Use of high-definition video capture technology
  o Use of high quality audio capture technology
  o Development of a shorter (e.g., <10 minute) case or a case in multiple short segments better suited for viewing on small mobile devices
- Prepare a storyboard (Note: PowerPoint is well suited for this task) and, if it is a digital case, prepare a written narrative script, at least in outline form
- Make clear separations between the story and the case analysis in the teaching note or Instructor's Manual (IM)

Test your case with students and colleagues before you submit for publication
- Test with live audiences and observe or ask for feedback about:
  o Logic of the narrative arc
  o Length of the narrative
  o Understanding of the case decision
  o Awareness of the alternatives under consideration
  o Gaps in character development
  o The need for other stakeholders’ voices
  o Comprehension of data and information (e.g., Too little? Too much? Just right?)
  o Clarity of sound and images if multimedia are used
  o Need for subtitles or closed captioning if multimedia are used
  o Reliability of narration, e.g., any biases communicated by the narrator
  o Appropriateness of any ambient sound or music in between interviews if multimedia are used
- Re-capture, re-edit, and test with audiences at least once more before classroom use or submission for an assignment or for publication

Source: Prepared by the authors for this paper.

Build a narrative arc. As a guide to preparing a wine business case, authors can use a more or less standard case-study format that includes five sections: 1) the strategic crisis or challenge (and its urgency); 2) an industry overview; 3) company background; 4) alternatives; and 5) future
directions or options. One of the great advantages to case writers inured to print media and to criticism about verb tensing issues, is that a digital media case — unless it is performed by actors using scripts to simulate a “live” performance — is automatically set in the past!

* * *
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