

November 2017

## Entrepreneurship Marketing in North Carolina's Wine Industry

George D. Shows

*Appalachian State University*, [showsgd@appstate.edu](mailto:showsgd@appstate.edu)

Pia A. Albinsson

*Appalachian State University*, [albinssonpa@appstate.edu](mailto:albinssonpa@appstate.edu)

James E. Stoddard

[stoddardje@appstate.edu](mailto:stoddardje@appstate.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/amj>



Part of the [Advertising and Promotion Management Commons](#), [Entrepreneurial and Small Business Operations Commons](#), [Marketing Commons](#), and the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Shows, George D.; Albinsson, Pia A.; and Stoddard, James E. (2017) "Entrepreneurship Marketing in North Carolina's Wine Industry," *Atlantic Marketing Journal*: Vol. 6 : No. 2 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/amj/vol6/iss2/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Atlantic Marketing Journal by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu).

---

# Entrepreneurship Marketing in North Carolina's Wine Industry

## **Cover Page Footnote**

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Mr. Whit Winslow, Executive Director of the N.C. Wine and Grape Council and the N.C Department of Agriculture for his invaluable help with the data collection for this project.

# Entrepreneurship Marketing in North Carolina's Wine Industry

G. David Shows, Appalachian State University  
showsgd@appstate.edu\*

Pia A. Albinsson, Appalachian State University  
albinssonpa@appstate.edu

James E. Stoddard, Appalachian State University  
stoddardje@appstate.edu

**Abstract** - Entrepreneurial marketing seeks to create, communicate and deliver value to customers and manage customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization. This paper explores whether increased entrepreneurial marketing practices at North Carolina wineries can lead to enhanced winery performance. A web survey was delivered to N.C. wineries by email. The results suggest that winery customer intensity and innovation were positively related to winery satisfaction of winery performance. In addition, innovation and value creation were found to be positively related to percentage sales gains at wineries.

**Keywords** - Regression Analysis, Entrepreneurial Marketing, Wineries

**Relevance to Marketing Educators, Researchers and/or Practitioners** - The research reported herein suggests that wineries implementing entrepreneurial practices may perform at a higher level than those that do not. Specifically, wineries that focused on nurturing long-term customer relationships and sought new ideas from inside and outside the organization reported higher satisfaction with their winery performance. In addition, wineries that sought new ideas from within and outside the organization and those that actively discovered and delivered value to their customers reported a higher positive percentage change in sales.

**Note:** A previous version of this paper was presented and published in the Proceedings of the 2016 AMA Conference

# Introduction

It has long been known that economic recessions impact consumer buying behavior. Flatters and Willmott (2009) have identified several manifestations in the most recent recession including consumer willingness to simplify their buying choices and to prefer simpler offerings with the greatest value. Post-recession consumers are also thriftier, more mercurial, more interested in environmentalism and have less respect for organizations such as the government and businesses. Finally, consumer demand for extreme-experience-seeking (expensive, risky, frivolous, or environmentally destructive) purchases has decreased as a result of a recession-induced mood of seriousness and responsibility.

These changes in consumer buying behavior are evidenced in the wine industry as well. Adler (2011) observed that the most recent economic downturn in 2007-2008 prompted wine consumers to shift to purchasing bottles selling at lower price points resulting in extreme downward price pressure for wineries. This shift to lower price point wines is expected to be long-term having the greatest impact on higher-priced wine regions. For these reasons it is of paramount importance that wineries adopt a more entrepreneurial marketing view of their organization so as to offer winery consumers a greater value offering.

The purpose of this paper is to propose that wineries pursuing a greater degree of strategic entrepreneurial marketing will perform at higher levels than wineries utilizing less entrepreneurial marketing strategies. The paper will first discuss the concept of entrepreneurial marketing. Next, the research method is described and the results are presented.

## Literature Review

One of the more ironic statistics to comprehend is that the majority of Fortune 500 companies were started in bear markets or recessions (Stangler, 2009). Recessions create layoffs and unemployment, and these lead to the creation of self-employed businesses (Farber, 1999). Evidence suggests that entrepreneurial firms can use marketing strategies to cope with recessions. Pearce and Michael (1997) suggested risk-taking strategies such as holding positions in diversified products and proactively establishing niche positions are prescriptions for survival during downturns. Srinivasan, Rangaswamy, and Lilien (2002) found that proactive marketing practices in firms with an entrepreneurial culture have both a direct and indirect effect on market performance. Many large firms in times of recession view these marketing downturns as opportunities to exploit weaknesses in competitive firms. Thus, in the spirit of entrepreneurship, recession is an opportunity when entrepreneurial marketing practices are executed.

Morris et al. (2002) conceptualized entrepreneurial marketing (EM) as the identification and exploitation of opportunities for acquiring customers through innovative approaches to risk management, the leveraging of resources, and the creation of value. Newer definitions have been proposed; Kraus et al. (2010, p. 27) proposed the fusion of the current AMA definition of marketing and others concerning entrepreneurship to create a definition of entrepreneurial marketing as “an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating, and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders, and that is characterized by innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and may be performed without resources currently controlled.” Morris et al. (2002) conceptualized EM efforts so that organizations should be able to (1) recognize opportunities to create and cultivate new

products, markets, customers, (2) act proactively and be more acceptable to novel tactics and more willing to experiment, (3) be innovative, (4) be willing to allow customers to be active in the process to create value, (5) be willing to accept and manage risk, (6) leverage limited resources in a period of potentially unlimited opportunities, and (7) be able strive to create value everywhere in the business.

Several of these dimensions are centered in the concept of entrepreneurial marketing. *Proactiveness* reflects leading rather than reacting (Morris et al., 2002), where a firm's proactiveness supports its ability to anticipate market shifts and changes in consumer needs (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). Proactiveness is defined as anticipating and acting to take advantage of new opportunities, being willing to eliminate products and operations when they are in decline, and being willing to risk competitive reaction to achieve a first-mover advantage (Venkatraman, 1989). Proactiveness is a dimension that is in concert with *innovation*, which is a firm's tendency to pursue unique opportunities and create new products (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Morris et al. (2002) described innovation as having a "healthy dissatisfaction" with the "way things are" and with organizations attempting to predict future consumer preferences and demands. *Risk-taking* stems from understanding that resources are finite and involves the capacity of an organization to handle difficulties (Wiklund & Shepherd, 2003). *Opportunity focus* derives from an organization's capacity to pursue opportunity with finite resources (Morris et al., 2002, Morris et al. 2013). Opportunities are market imperfections; such as perceptual aspirations consumers have that remain unfulfilled. *Resource leveraging* is simply "doing more with less," i.e. maximizing limited resources (Morris et al., 2002). Given these limited resources, an entrepreneurial organization will rely on their proactiveness and innovativeness to exploit resources they control to create unique competencies (Miles & Darroch, 2006). When organizations have insufficient resources to pursue market opportunities, they will likely exchange knowledge and discuss strategies with other organizations to succeed. In this way, they can lower risk and increase intellectual assets (Miles & Darroch, 2006; Kraus et al., 2012). *Value creation* is a key component of entrepreneurship (Stevenson et al., 1989) and implies adding value to the customer experience (Morris et al., 2002).

Extant research on entrepreneurial marketing in the wine industry is limited. However, Chaudhury et al. (2014) conducted an exploratory study on New Mexico winemakers as entrepreneurial marketers. They found preliminary support for several EM dimensions such as pursuing opportunities, proactiveness and innovation, value creation via customer participation, and collaboration through the sharing of resources. Other scholars have explored entrepreneurial orientation in the Australian wine industry (Griffin & Coulthard, 2005), cooperative relationships as a requirement for industry growth in North Carolina (Taplin & Breckenridge 2008), various entrepreneurial models utilized by wineries in Tuscany (Mattiacci *et al.*, 2006; Charters & Menival, 2008; Taplin & Breckenridge, 2008), and the impact of entrepreneurial behavior on return on investment in a cross-cultural context (Gilinsky et al., 2010). However, no validated scale on the entrepreneurial marketing dimensions has existed until recently (Fiore et al. 2013). We extend previous research on entrepreneurial marketing by conducting an empirical study on the EM characteristics of North Carolina winemakers.

# The North Carolina Wine Industry

While wineries have been in North Carolina not long after Sir Walter Raleigh landed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century (North Carolina's Wine History, 2017), the state has been the host of tremendous winery growth in the last 20 years. Between 1995 and 2006 the number of wineries in North Carolina went from 9 to 57 (Taplin & Breckenridge, 2008) and is currently 10<sup>th</sup> in the country in wine production. Commercial vineyards, those that do not sell directly to the public, increased from 68 in 1991 to over 350 by 2007. Currently there are about 142 wineries in North Carolina that focus on native muscadine wines and the more common table wine grapes such as the European vinifera grapes (Frank, Rimerman and Co. 2015) and have an annual economic impact of \$1.76 billion annually and support nearly 7,600 jobs. There are over 400 individually owned grape vineyards in North Carolina that cover over 1,800 acres, with 40 wineries clustered near each other in Yadkin Valley, comprising some 400 acres. This area is home to many boutique wineries that participate in Yadkin Valley Wine tours which run from January to October and consumers visit different wineries during the season (Yadkin Valley Tours, 2016). Far from competition, the wineries coalesce to create unique venues for tourists, including “trails” through North Carolina to visit multiple wineries in a given day.

Wineries that work together in such a fashion accept risk in banding together. For example, visiting multiple wineries in a short period of time can encourage consumers to compare wineries, and thus allow consumers to mentally “rank” them from superior to inferior. In addition, visiting more than one winery encourages consumers to forgo their total purchase dollars on a single winery and accept only a portion of the overall expenditure. However, in accepting the risk in this proactive behavior, wineries create value by providing variety to the consumer experience. Collective action in rural development practices such as winery collaboration have been found to enable local entrepreneurs improve economic performance and create opportunities for growth (Brunori & Rossi, 2000). Therefore, in accepting risk, wineries embrace the willingness to proactively engage potential competitors in a collaborative fashion thereby increasing the value of the overall customer experience. This increase in value for the customer experience is expected to improve customer satisfaction, which in the long term may yield an increase in future repeat purchasing behavior and winery performance (Anderson, Fornell & Lehmann, 1994).

Given the preceding discussion, we propose that entrepreneurial marketing practices by wineries will be positively related to winery performance.

## Research Method

Surveys were made available via Qualtrics to the 142 members on the list of North Carolina wineries identified by the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services in the summer of 2015. Data collection proceeded through November resulting in 33 usable surveys (23% response rate). Note that this response rate is similar to that found by Klapowitz, Hadlock and Lavine (2004) comparing web and mail survey response rates.

## Survey Instrument and Measures

The survey included 2 sections, entrepreneurial marketing questions and general questions about the winery such as demographics and performance. The degree to which a winery employed entrepreneurial marketing strategies was assessed using a modified version of the scale developed

by Fiore et al. (2013). The 20 scale statements identified the key dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing, including proactive orientation, opportunity driven, customer intensity, innovation focused, risk management, and value creation. The degree to which a winery practiced entrepreneurial marketing was assessed using a 7-point Likert scale anchored by (1) "Does not reflect my winery at all" and (7) "Fully reflects my winery." Although no attempt was made to replicate the factor analysis conducted by Fiore et al. (2013) to validate the scale (due to the small sample size), scale reliabilities were acceptable (proactive orientation  $\alpha = .892$ , opportunity driven  $\alpha = .881$ , customer intensity  $\alpha = .804$ , innovation focused  $\alpha = .811$ , risk management  $\alpha = .615$ , value creation  $\alpha = .825$ ).

Winery performance was measured by 2 single item questions, one 7-point question asked if wineries were satisfied with their performance anchored by (1) "Very unsatisfied" and (7) "Very satisfied." The second performance measure asked wineries to compare their 2013 sales with their 2014 sales and indicate the percentage change on a 7-point scale ranging from (1) "Down over 10%" to (7) "Up Over 10%."

The demographic questions asked wineries about how long the winery had been operating, their annual sales volume (cases), and number of full- and part-time employees.

## Results

### Overall Sample Statistics

The sample statistics included the number of years the winery had been in operation ( $M = 13.77$ ), the winery's estimated annual sales volume ( $M = 7,581$ ), and number of full- and part-time employees ( $M = 15$  and  $M = 11.58$  respectively).

The proposition advanced was that there would be a positive relationship between wineries that practice entrepreneurial marketing and winery performance. To test this proposition several simple linear regression analyses were conducted. The dependent variables included satisfaction with winery performance and percentage change in winery sales from 2013 to 2014. The independent variables in the 6 regression equations were winery proactive orientation, whether the winery was opportunity driven, the customer intensity of the winery, whether the winery was innovation focused, winery risk management and winery value creation.

### Satisfaction with Winery Performance

Six regression equations assessed the relationship between each of the entrepreneurial marketing dimensions and satisfaction with winery performance. Of the six, two were found to be statistically significant. Customer intensity, the degree to which wineries try to establish long term relationships was positively related to winery satisfaction with their performance ( $F = 6.935$ ,  $p = .012$ ). Wineries that tried to establish long-term relationships with their customers were more satisfied with their winery's performance (see Table 1).

**Table 1**  
**The Relationship between Customer Intensity and Satisfaction with Winery Performance**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.402 <sup>a</sup>	.162	.138	1.410

a. Predictors: (Constant), custintense

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.790	1	13.790	6.935	.012 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	71.579	36	1.988		
	Total	85.368	37			

a. Dependent Variable: 28. Please tell us whether you are satisfied with your winery's performance:

b. Predictors: (Constant), custintense

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.110	1.023		2.062	.046
	custintense	.166	.063	.402	2.634	.012

a. Dependent Variable: 28. Please tell us whether you are satisfied with your winery's performance:

In addition, innovation, the degree to which the winery seeks new ideas from within and outside the business, was also positively related to satisfaction with winery performance ( $F = 3.510$ ,  $p = .069$ ). Wineries that sought new ideas from within and outside the business were more satisfied with their winery's performance (see Table 2).

## Percentage Change in Winery Sales

Six regression equations modeled the relationship between each of the entrepreneurial marketing dimensions and year on year sales percentage changes. Again, two of the six entrepreneurial marketing dimensions were found to be statistically significant. Innovation, the degree to which the winery seeks new ideas from within and outside of the business was positively related to percentage sales gains ( $F = 5.012$ ,  $p = .031$ ). Wineries that seek out new ideas from within and outside the business saw a positive percentage sales change (see Table 3).



**Table 2**  
**The Relationship between Winery Innovation and Satisfaction with Winery Performance**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.298 <sup>a</sup>	.089	.064	1.470

a. Predictors: (Constant), innovation

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.584	1	7.584	3.510	.069 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	77.784	36	2.161		
	Total	85.368	37			

a. Dependent Variable: 28. Please tell us whether you are satisfied with your winery's performance:

b. Predictors: (Constant), innovation

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
		1	(Constant)	2.502		
	innovation	.135	.072	.298	1.874	.069

a. Dependent Variable: 28. Please tell us whether you are satisfied with your winery's performance:

In addition, value creation, the degree to which the winery discovers and delivers value for their customers was positively related to percentage sales gains ( $F = 3.545, p = .068$ ). Wineries that discover and deliver value for their customers saw a positive percentage sales change (see Table 4).

## Discussion and Conclusion

This research builds upon the qualitative work of Chaudhury et al. (2014) by confirming via quantitative research the entrepreneurial characteristics of wine merchants, including their acceptance of innovation (idea seeking), and their commitment to long term customer

relationships (customer intensity). These two dimensions were found to be positively related to the winery's satisfaction with performance.

**Table 3**  
**The Relationship between Winery Innovation and Year on Year Sales**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.350 <sup>a</sup>	.122	.098	1.065

a. Predictors: (Constant), innovation

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.689	1	5.689	5.012	.031 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	40.864	36	1.135		
	Total	46.553	37			

a. Dependent Variable: 34. Compared to your winery's 2013 sales, what happened to 2014 sales?

b. Predictors: (Constant), innovation

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.407	.882		3.864	.000
	innovation	.117	.052	.350	2.239	.031

a. Dependent Variable: 34. Compared to your winery's 2013 sales, what happened to 2014 sales?

In addition, more innovative wineries (those open to new ideas) were associated with a positive percentage sales change. Finally, wineries that were more value creation oriented were also found to be positively rewarded by consumers resulting in a positive change in sales.

**Table 4**  
**The Relationship between Winery Value Creation and Year on Year Sales**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.299 <sup>a</sup>	.090	.064	1.085

a. Predictors: (Constant), valuecreate

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.173	1	4.173	3.545	.068 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	42.380	36	1.177		
	Total	46.553	37			

a. Dependent Variable: 34. Compared to your winery's 2013 sales, what happened to 2014 sales?

b. Predictors: (Constant), valuecreate

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.577	.954		3.749	.001
	valuecreate	.076	.040	.299	1.883	.068

a. Dependent Variable: 34. Compared to your winery's 2013 sales, what happened to 2014 sales?

For the first time in the post-World War II period, the United States has lived through a decade in which there hasn't been a year of growth of 3% or more (Gosselin, 2015). Given this circumstance, wineries should reassess their traditional position on competition, growth, and strategy. As stated, in economic downturns, wineries that turn to entrepreneurial practices to succeed during difficult times increase their chances for success, or perhaps survival. Our research into the wine industry supports these concepts and provides new insight in succeeding in difficult times.

Future research should explore other variables consistent with the entrepreneurial characteristics of wineries including concepts such as "competitive cooperation" when it adds to overall value for the customer. While collaboration in some industries may seem highly improbable, in the wine industry the possibility for successful cooperation and even collaboration seems reasonable (i.e., winery clusters).

## References

- Adler, S. (2011) Recession forces farmers and wine marketers to adjust. *Stonebridge Research*. Online: <http://www.stonebridgeresearch.com/recession-forces-farmers-and-wine-marketers-adjust-steve-adler>. Accessed March 3, 2016.
- Anderson, E., Fornell, C., and Lehmann, D. (1994) Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 53-66.
- Brunori, G. and Rossi, A. (2000) Synergy and coherence through collective action: some *insights from wine routes in Tuscany*. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40, 409–423.
- Charters, S. and Menival, D. (2008) A typology of small producers in the champagne industry. In *4th International Wine Business Research Conference, Siena*.
- Chaudhury, S., Albinsson, P.A., Shows, G.D and Moench, V. (2014) Entrepreneurial marketing efforts of New Mexico wine-makers: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 26(4), 259-278.
- Farber, H. S. (1999) *Alternative and part-time employment arrangements as a response to job loss* (No. w7002). National bureau of economic research.
- Fiore, A. M., Niehm, L. S., Hurst, J. L., Son, J., and Sadachar, A. (2013) Entrepreneurial marketing: scale validation with small, independently-owned businesses. *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*, 7(4), 63-86.
- Flatters, P. and Willmott, M. (2009) Understanding the post-recession consumer. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August: 1-8.
- Frank, Rimmerman and Co. (2015) *The Economic Impact of North Carolina Wine and Wine Grapes - 2013*. Retrieved August 21, 2016 from Visit NC: <https://partners.visitnc.com/files/files/teim/2015-Impact-of-North-Carolina-Wine-on-Economy.pdf>
- Gilinsky, Jr. A., Lopez, R. H., Santini, C., and Eyler, R. (2010) Big bets, small wins? entrepreneurial behavior and ROI. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 22(3), 238-250.
- Gosselin, P. (2015) *The U.S. Economy Is on Track to Finish a Decade Without Significant Growth*. Retrieved August 20, 2016, from Bloomberg Markets: <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-07-31/the-u-s-economy-is-on-track-to-cap-a-lost-decade-for-growth>
- Griffin, T. and Coulthard, M. (2005) The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on the Australian wine industry”, working paper, Monash University, Melbourne.

Klapowitz, M.D., Hadlock, T.D. and Levine, R. (2004) A Comparison of Web and Mail Survey Response Rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(1), 94-101.

Kraus, S., Harms, R., and Fink, M. (2010) Entrepreneurial marketing: Moving beyond marketing in new ventures. *International Journal Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 11(1), 19-34.

Kraus S. Filser, M, Eggers, F., Hills, G.E., and Hultman, C.M. (2012) The entrepreneurial marketing domain: a citation and co-citation analysis, *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 14(1), 6-26.

Lumpkin, G. T. and Dess, G. G. (1996) Enriching the entrepreneurial orientation construct-a reply to Entrepreneurial Orientation or Pioneer Advantage, *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 114-131.

Lumpkin, G. T. and Dess, G. G. (2001) Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 429-451.

Mattiacci A., Nosi, C. and Zanni, L. (2006) Wine business in Tuscany: evidence on entrepreneurial models and local systems. Paper presented at 3<sup>rd</sup> International Wine Business Research Conference, Montpellier.

Miles, M. P. and Darroch, J. (2006) Large firms, entrepreneurial marketing processes, and the cycle of competitive advantage. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(5/6), 485-501.

Morris, M.H., Schindehutte, M., and LaForge, R.W. (2002) Entrepreneurial marketing: a construct for integrating emerging entrepreneurship and marketing perspectives. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10(4), 1-15.

Morris, M.H., Davis B., Mills, A., Pitt, L.F. and Bethon, P. (2013) Opportunity and the Entrepreneurial Marketer, in Sethna, Z., Jones R., and Harrigan P. (Eds.) *Entrepreneurial Marketing*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, UK, 127-146.

North Carolina's Wine History (2017) available at: <https://media.visitnc.com/news/north-carolina-s-wine-story> (accessed February 7, 2017)

Pearce, J.A. II and Michael, S.C. (1997) Marketing Strategies that make Entrepreneurial Firms Recession-Resistant, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(4), 301-314.

Srinivasan, R., Lilien, G. L., and Rangaswamy, A. (2002) Technological opportunism and radical technology adoption: An application to e-business. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(3), 47-60.

Stangler, D. (2009) The economic future just happened. *Available at SSRN 1580136*.

Stevenson, H.H., Roberts, M.J. and Grousbeck, H.I. (1989) *New business ventures and the entrepreneur*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Taplin, I.M. and Breckenridge, R.S. (2008) Large firms, legitimation and industry identity: the growth of the North Carolina wine industry. *The Social Science Journal*, 45, 352-260.

Venkatraman, N. (1989) Strategic orientation of business enterprises: the construct, dimensionality, and measurement. *Management Science*, 35(8), 942-962.

Wiklund, J. and Shepherd D. (2003) Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 1307-1314.

*Yadkin Valley Wine Tours*. (2016, January 2). Retrieved April 28, 2016, from Yadkin Wine Tours: <http://www.yadkinwinetours.com>

## Author Information

### G. David Shows

(D.B.A., Louisiana Tech University) is an Assistant Professor of Marketing in the John A. Walker College of Business at Appalachian State University. His research includes focus on entrepreneurial marketing, restorative atmospherics, and intersubjectivity in co-creation activities. His research can be found in the *Journal of Business Research*, *Journal of Creating Value*, *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, and other journals and proceedings.

### Pia A. Albinsson

(Ph.D., New Mexico State University) is an Associate Professor of Marketing in the John A. Walker College of Business at Appalachian State University. Her research which focuses on green consumption practices, value co-creation, entrepreneurial marketing, and advertising effectiveness have been published in *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, *European Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Macromarketing* and many other journals and proceedings.

### James E. Stoddard

(Ph.D., Virginia Tech) is a Professor of Marketing in the John A. Walker College of Business at Appalachian State University. His research can be found in publications such as the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, the *Journal of Marketing Channels*, *Psychology and Marketing*, *Tourism Economics* as well as several other journals and proceedings.